Thus the schedule for next week will be full, and record votes can be expected each day, Monday through Friday, on each of these measures.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1976

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until the hour of 11 a.m. Monday, February 2, 1976.

The motion was agreed to; and at 12:38 p.m. the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 2, 1976, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 30, 1976:

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL ADMINISTRATION

Jean McKee, of New York, to be Deputy Administrator of the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration, vice Marjorie W. Lynch.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 30, 1976:

IN THE COAST GUARD

Coast Guard nominations beginning David A. Bailey, to be lieutenant commander, and ending Samuel R. Hardman, to be lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on December 15, 1975.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SAN ANTONIO'S FAME FAR SPREAD

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, all of us here in the House of Representatives come from every part of our great Nation. It is our high privilege to represent our own respective district in the Congress and, quite naturally, we are justly proud of our own area.

I have the honor of being one of the Representatives of the great State of Texas, and my particular constituency embraces mainly the core of the city of San Antonio. It is the third largest city of the "Lone Star" State and the banking, transportation and retail trade center for south central Texas. According to the latest U.S. Census Bureau figures, San Antonio's population has risen to the point where it is now among the 10 largest cities.

San Antonio played a leading role in the history of early Texas, and today presents a fascinating variety of the new and the old, a progressive and modern American city flavored with the grace and charm of Spanish influence. Originally established in 1718, long before the original American colonies—the original 13 States—formed a new Nation, San Antonio was a Spanish military post and has always been militarily important. Today, it is still important and its fame has spread throughout America and, indeed, all around the world.

As evidence of San Antonio's vitality and its recognition as a city of considerable significance, I should like to invite the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an interesting article which was printed in the Evening Sun of Baltimore, Md., on December 18, 1975, entitled "City Famed for Alamo."

This article is as follows:

CITY FAMED FOR ALAMO

SAN ANTONIO.—San Antonio is a fooler.

It's the third largest city in Texas with a population of some 800,000 but has such small-town charm and friendliness that you'd never guess it.

Interstates from every direction lead to within a few blocks of downtown, but even after you leave the expressways, traffic is not much of a problem.

It's a different downtown, too.

Right in the center of the city is the famed Alamo, with a plaza around it. A block or so away are the grounds of Hemis-Fair '68. Nearby is LaVillita, a restoration of the city's earliest settlement, almost hidden by trees and shrubbery.

And beneath downtown is the River Walk, or Paseo del Rio as it is called in Spanish.

It's a fascinating mile and a half, tree-and-flower lined walkway along the San Antonio River, with restaurants, cafes, nightspots, shops, art galleries, a couple of hotels and even an outdoor theater. There's nothing quite like it anywhere else in the United States.

You can cruise under the main streets, hire a do-it-yourself pedalboat, go strolling, or just sit at one of the outdoor tables and "people watch." Fifty per cent of San Antonio's residents are Mexican Americans and you'll hear a lot of Spanish.

Many of the shops on the streets above have river entrances at their back doors.

The river was rerouted during HemisFair '68 to take passengers to the fair area—and it still does. A boat can deliver you to the Civic Center, which includes an exhibit hall, the Theater for the Performing Arts seating 2,800 on three levels and the arena with 10,500 seating capacity.

INCENTIVE NEEDED

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have often defended the free market system for agricultural production. Incentive is the method needed to encourage production of food and fiber in a food-short world. Christopher Wren's recent article in the New York Times points to the need for the Soviet leadership to "challenge the basic ideological concept of collective and state farms or otherwise fathom why farmers produce better for themselves than for the state." Weather is not the only factor in reduced Soviet grain output.

We, as a nation, must not take our production capabilities for granted. A combination of factors including the incentive and profit factor have made this Nation's agricultural machine the envy of the world. Our farmers would be embarrassed if we had to pass legislation to prevent machinery abuse. But in Russia, according to Mr. Wren, legislation has been enacted providing prison terms for criminal negligence in abusing machinery.

I recommend the following article from the New York Times so that all might reflect on the advantages of our own system:

NOT ONLY DROUGHT HURTS SOVIET CROPS

(By Christopher S. Wren)

MOSCOW.—When the Soviet Union suffered its worst harvest in a decade last year, the Kremlin blamed the weather. But the prolonged drought of 1975 was not solely responsible for the sad yield that officials implied was only 135 million tons, or more than one-third below plan.

For the problems of Soviet agriculture entail more than just the vagaries of a severe climate. The nation's 47,300 state and collective farms are saddled with an impersonal, centrally planned system that responds clumsily to the sort of emergencies that sprang up last year after the rains stopped.

Since the Communist Party plenum of March, 1965, increasing investments have been plowed into agriculture, accelerating from 131 billion rubles over the last five years to 171.7 billion rubles (about $227 billion) in the new five-year plan. Yet, one Western diplomatic analyst contends, "They're stuck with the system, and the farmer who is actually doing the work still doesn't have either the tools or the incentive to do a good job."

The comparison with American agriculture is not flattering. About one-quarter of the Soviet labor force works in agriculture, in contrast to only 4 percent in the United States. A 1972 Department of Commerce study found that one Soviet farm worker fed seven persons while his American counterpart fed 46.

A basic reason for the inefficiency, Western agricultural specialists believe, is that Soviet farmers are told from Moscow what to grow and when to plant and harvest, rather than be allowed to follow their instincts. The chairmen of the 29,600 collective farms and the directors of the 17,700 state farms are usually not entrusted with the most crucial decisions but must try to cope with a flood of directives from above.

There is evidence that productivity flourishes with sufficient incentive. About 3 percent of sown acreage in the Soviet Union reportedly consists of private plots, generally a half-acre or less, allotted to farmers. Yet, recent Soviet statistics show that the private plots provide consumers with 64 percent of their potatoes, 53 percent of their vegetables, 41 percent of their eggs and 22 percent of their meat and milk.

Such efficiency does not seem to carry over to the state sector. Even before the 1975 drought was fully felt, the Soviet press was raising its perennial complaints about poorly maintained machinery, untrained operators and a widespread shortage of spare parts.

In late 1974, a senior agricultural official

reported that over 50,000 farm machines had been left out in the rain. He added that farmers had junked nearly 15,000 tractors, combines and other agricultural machinery prematurely. Some operators, he said, were parking their harvesters at home for personal transportation.

Regional reports last year, such as that of 2,500 combines sidelines in Kazakhstan, indicated that machinery was still being abused, despite legislation providing prison terms for criminal negligence.

The uneven support by Soviet industry includes more than just lack of spare parts. Last September, the newspaper Pravda disclosed that a special harvester first developed in 1964 was still not in full production. Of 10,000 harvesters ordered, only 30 had been delivered, Pravda said, calling the delay "incomprehensible."

Agriculture has been further hampered by lack of sufficient transport and storage facilities. Even after modest harvests, some grain has been left out in the open to rot. Following the 1973 bumper harvest of 222.5 million tons, the Soviet party chief, Leonid I. Brezhnev, charged that post-harvest losses were so extensive that nobody would "estimate the sum total." Some Western analysts have guessed that possibly 20 percent of the grain is lost to negligence or theft, not infrequently by the farmers themselves.

Life remains hard for the farm worker, particularly if he lives in one of the many villages that still lack running water and inside toilets. To help resolve the low pay, the state has called for collective farm salaries to rise to 90 rubles a month this year (about $119), which is well below the projected industrial wage of 150 rubles. But in many rural stores, consumer goods are so scarce that there is relatively little for him to buy.

One consequence in some areas has been an exodus of young male skilled workers to the cities, leaving the brunt of farm labor to be performed less efficiently by the elderly and female. A recent report called the migration problem "urgent" and noted that between 1959 and 1970, the rural population between 20 and 29 years old had declined from 16.7 percent to 9.6 percent, while the proportion of those 55 years and older rose.

The Kremlin's answer has been to try to raise output with massive infusions of machinery, fertilizer and land improvement. Even with the 1975 disaster, the average harvest yield during the last five-year plan rose 8 percent while falling short of the original 21.7 percent target.

But the Soviet leadership appears unwilling to challenge the basic ideological concept of collective and state farms or otherwise fathom why farmers produce better for themselves than for the state. For the short-term, it has resigned itself to meeting expanded needs in part by buying grain from the West. It is a measure of the Kremlin's discomfort that such purchases have been kept a secret from the Russian people.

KASTEN CONGRESSIONAL CLUB

HON. ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. Speaker, since taking the oath of office as Representative of the Ninth District of Wisconsin, one of my top priorities has been the planning and implementation of comprehensive, open communications with the constituents I represent.

To assist in reaching this objective, the Kasten Congressional Club was organized on June 4, 1975. For the record, I want to briefly summarize the purposes, membership, receipts, and disbursements of the organization in 1975.

Purposes of the club, as stated in its articles of organization, are as follows:

The purposes of the Kasten Congressional Club shall be to assist the Representative to the United States House of Representatives from the 9th Congressional District of the State of Wisconsin in communicating from time to time with the constituents of the 9th Congressional District and to provide financial assistance for those ongoing functions of office which may not be adequately provided by the United States government. It is the intent of this Club that the fulfillment of such purposes will enable the electorate of the 9th Congressional District to be served more effectively and openly in the United States House of Representatives, and it is the belief of the Club that two-way communication between citizens and their elected officials is an essential ingredient of effective democracy.

I want to stress that campaign involvement by the club is strictly forbidden by its articles of organization which state:

Under no circumstances shall this Club participate in any way or in any activity which has as its purpose influencing the nomination for election, or election, of any person to Federal office.

Mr. Speaker, the club is governed by an executive committee consisting of four outstanding community leaders in the ninth district. It includes Henry O. Allen, chairman; Mrs. James Englander, secretary; Ralph S. Huiras, and M. E. Nevins.

Membership is open to any resident of the ninth district who voluntarily pays annual dues of no more than $25 per person. All 1975 contributions were personal, and no funds were contributed by corporations or labor unions.

As of December 31, 1975, the club consisted of 303 members. Total receipts for the year were $7,581 and total disbursements $7,503.90.

The following account covers the operation of the Kasten Congressional Club from June 4, 1975, through December 31, 1975:

Receipts

Memberships (303 at $25 per person)	$7,575.00
Miscellaneous contributions	6.00
Total receipts	7,581.00

Disbursements

Newsletters	$4,200.00
Meetings	1,377.90
Travel	1,033.34
Membership appeals	772.72
Supplies	119.94
Total disbursements	7,503.90
Cash on hand, Dec. 31, 1975	77.10

Organization of the Kasten Congressional Club has provided a service to the constituents of the Ninth District by increasing the opportunities for two-way communications. It has served as a valuable supplement to the official duties of my congressional office.

ENVIRONMENTALISM AND JOBS

HON. ALAN STEELMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Star on December 27, 1975. The first Environmental Industry Conference, sponsored by the Council on Environmental Quality, was held here in Washington on December 10, 1975. The Conference brought together representatives of the environmental industry, the academic community, and the Government in a valuable forum to discuss present and expected future contributions of the environmental industry to the economy.

Speakers at the Conference pointed out that as pollution control requirements become more stringent, the technology to meet those requirements expands, creating a new job source. This first Environmental Industry Conference brought to light previously seldom-considered ways in which environmental quality and economic goals can be pursued in harmony. I commend the editorial to my colleagues for their consideration:

ENVIRONMENTALISM AND JOBS

Time and again we've heard it—how the environmental protection movement is taking a heavy economic toll, in curtailed industry and lost jobs, at a time when the country can ill afford it. The familiar line is that sacrifices of payroll for the sake of purer air and water can best await another time—after work has been found for our 8 million unemployed. Large scale depollution is portrayed as a hazardous luxury in our parlous economy, so let us allow the smokestacks to belch and the rivers to be fouled, for a while yet.

For the most part, though, this scare talk has been unspecific and undocumented, and those who have been talking may wish they hadn't. For the President's Council on Environmental Quality was provoked this year into gathering the specifics, which seem to prove dramatically that just the opposite it true—that the environmental effort is, by dizzying leaps and bounds, creating more jobs and production than it elimnates.

This salutary trend was the major revelation during the first Environmental Industry Conference, held here earlier this month under CEQ sponsorship. The highlight was a study report showing that pollution control programs now provide about 1.1 million jobs in the U.S., much of this in growing industries that produce equipment for these purposes.

By stunning contrast, Environmental Protection Agency studies show 75 plant closings, from January 1971 to June of this year, affecting 13,900 employes. But all of those jobs weren't lost; in some cases production is shifted to other plants when a polluting plant is shut down.

In fact, the CEQ study (by a team of Wall Street analysts) concludes that "environmental control-related employment has been one of the relatively few areas of job strength during the recent recession," and that this employment could well "expand several fold over the next decade." Much of this is in public work and construction, of

course, but industrial and technological expansion to cope with the depollution challenge is a big factor. One aspect has been noted all too seldom. The U.S. is the world leader in this field, and our exports of antipollution equipment have been growing rapidly—and are projected to expand in the years just ahead at a much faster rate.

So there is a real economic plus in the depollution initiative—many more jobs to be gained than lost, so it seems. "Today," says Russell Peterson, chairman of the CEQ, "plants that pollute are obsolescent and inefficient. Their failure to modernize will threaten the jobs of their employes." But the modernizing itself, along with the rest of the necessary environmental cleanup, will furnish a great deal more employment than is lost, while enhancing our health and quality of life in general.

And how much more satisfying it will be to produce the stuff that saves us, rather than asphyxiates us, even if it doesn't come quite as cheap.

LET'S MAKE A TREATY

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to insert in the RECORD an article concerning the U.S. military sales policy by Mr. Art Buchwald which appeared in the Washington Post this morning.

The United States is to the military sales game what Hertz is to the rent-a-car business: We are No. 1. The game described by Mr. Buchwald is, unfortunately, not all that far from reality.

The article follows:

LET'S MAKE A TREATY: US MILITARY AID FOR WORLD FRIENDSHIP

(By Art Buchwald)

The United States has just signed a new military treaty with Spain. In exchange we will, of course, supply the Spanish with armaments so we can keep our bases there.

It seems that we can't make a deal with any country without giving them arms in exchange for friendship. There is a suspicion that the State Department has been influenced by all the TV game shows and it seems to me that since the American people pay for most of the military aid, we should at least be permitted to watch the U.S. hand out the stuff on television in a game show format.

This is just a suggestion. Every week the State Department would produce a TV program called "Let's Make a Treaty."

Henry Kissinger would be the master of ceremonies and the audience would be made up of ambassadors from all the countries of the "free World."

He would call out a number and the ambassador from that nation would jump up on the stage.

Henry would say, "Where are you from, sir?"

"Zambia," the ambassador would reply excitedly. (Applause)

"All right. I'm going to ask you a question. If you can answer it correctly I will give you $100 million. Are you ready?"

The ambassador, jumping up and down, says, "Yes, yes."

"The question is: 'Who is the President of the United States?' "

The ambassador hesitates. "Gerry Ford?"

"That is correct." Henry shouts, and he counts out $100 million. The ambassador hugs and kisses Mr. Kissinger as the audience goes wild.

"Now don't go away," says Henry. "You can keep the $100 million or give it back to me in exchange for what is behind one of the three curtains over there. Joan Braden, will you tell us some of the prizes that are behind the curtains?"

"Henry, we have the new version of the Hawk missile, a 1976 super Sherman tank, a year's supply of cruise missiles, a complete nuclear energy plant which will be installed absolutely free, and a squadron of F-15 fighter planes."

"All right, Mr. Ambassador," Henry says, "do you want to keep the $100 million or do you want to go for the prizes behind the curtains?"

The ambassador clutching the money looks out at the audience. "Keep the money," some ambassadors scream. Others yell, "Go for the curtain."

The ambassador says to Henry, "Can I consult with my government?"

"I'm sorry, we don't have time. What's it going to be?"

The ambassador hands back the $100 million. "I'll go for what's behind the curtain."

The audience applauds loudly.

"All right," Henry says. "He's going for what's behind the curtain. We have curtain number one, curtain number two and curtain number three. Which one will you choose?"

The ambassador hesitates as the audience shouts out, "Two." "One." "Three."

Finally, he says, "Curtain number three."

The curtain opens and there is a pile of rotten wheat.

The audience groans.

"Well, Mr. Ambassador, it looks like you made a mistake. But since you've been such a good sport we've got a consolation prize for you. Joan, what's the consolation prize?"

Ms. Braden pushes away the pile of rotten wheat and behind it is a brand-new nuclear submarine.

Henry grinning says, "You gave up $100 million in cash, but you have won a new nuclear submarine which is worth $450 million. Here are the keys to it."

The audience goes crazy as the ambassador jumps up and down and rushes over to the nuclear submarine and climbs up on the conning tower.

Henry, beaming, says to the audience, "Well, that's it for tonight, folks. If you are an accredited member of any freedom loving country in the world and you would like to be on 'Let's Make a Treaty,' write to me at the State Department for tickets. All the prizes given away on this program were donated through the courtesy of the American taxpayer in the interests of world peace. Thank you, God bless you, and we'll see you all next week."

MINUTEMAN PRODUCTION NECESSARY FOR SALT TALKS

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget proposes that we stop production of one of our two main deterrent weapons, the Minuteman III ICBM. This is in spite of the fact that the Russians have four different ICBM's in production right now—"production," not research or development. The Minuteman III is our only ICBM in production today, and it is unlikely that we could have a new one into meaningful production for nearly a decade, according to Defense Department officials.

Does Secretary Kissinger think that arms limitation talks will proceed more easily, and that an agreement will be easier to achieve, if we stop production on one of our major strategic components and then threaten to start it back up again if progress is not achieved? If he does, I think he is dead wrong.

The Russians are aware of how the American economic system works. They know that if we do in fact stop production on the Minuteman III, a long series of highly skilled technicians who work for the contractors and subcontractors will be put out of work. They will not sit idly by. They will find new jobs, to the extent they can in today's economy, and they will move to new locations if necessary. Given this, how credible is it to say that we will start production again? Not credible at all, Mr. Speaker, for it will take years to reassemble the manpower needed to get the production line going again.

Reducing Federal expenditures is something with which we all agree. But it cannot—or should not—be done blindly.

Earlier this week Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld testified before the Armed Services Committee. Much of his testimony dealt with ICBM's and our overall strategic posture. I believe that his analysis is an important component in this debate. At this point in my own analysis I am convinced that stopping production of the Minuteman III now would be taking an unnecessary and unacceptable risk, and I believe that the Secretary's warnings support that position.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I seek permission to introduce a copy of the Washington Post article which reported on the Armed Services hearings and Secretary Rumsfeld's testimony:

U.S. MAY NEED $30 BILLION MISSILE PROGRAM

(By George C. Wilson)

The United States may have to spend $30 billion in the next decade to replace its present force of land-based strategic missiles to combat a growing Soviet threat, the Pentagon said yesterday in releasing its annual posture statement.

Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld, in presenting his report to the House Armed Services Committee, also disclosed that additional billions must be spent on submarines, ships and bombers unless the United States and Soviet Union find new ways to brake the arms race.

"While the Soviets advocate restraint in the development of new strategic weapon systems by others," the Pentagon statement complained, "they appear unwilling to practice restraint in their own strategic weapons development."

To offset the Soviet threat, Rumsfeld said the President was recommending that Congress approve these amounts for strategic weaponry for fiscal 1977:

—$84 million to explore the possibilities of a new land-based missile, dubbed the MX, more than double the $36 million earmarked for it in fiscal 1976.

—$2.9 billion for the Navy's Trident submarine, which carries 24 missiles, $1 billion

more than in fiscal 1976. The Pentagon is planning to build more than the 10 Tridents previously authorized, defense officials said.

—$1.5 billion for the Air Force B–1 bomber—more than double the $661 million for fiscal year 1976.

—$262 million to accelerate development of long-range cruise missiles which would be launched by airplanes and submarines—compared to $144 million for the current 1976 fiscal year.

The Ford administration is trying to work out some trade-off of U.S. cruise missiles and Soviet Backfire bombers as part of a new strategic arms limitation agreement with the Soviet Union.

"Pending outcome of these negotiations," said Rumsfeld, the two cruise missile programs are proceeding "at a deliberate pace."

Former Defense Secretary James R. Schlesinger and his principal deputy, William P. Clements Jr., had urged the Navy to consider building a nonnuclear-powered aircraft carrier of medium size, with the downpayment to be made in the fiscal 1977 budget.

But the Pentagon's report to Congress shows that the revised plan is to stick with nuclear-powered carriers—with money for the next two carriers projected for the fiscal 1979 and 1981 budgets.

The Pentagon is asking Congress to increase its budget in real dollars—as opposed to having extra money appropriated and eaten up by inflation.

The strategic weapons account will start a sharp upward surge this coming year if Congress goes along—rising from $7.3 billion to $9.4 billion from fiscal 1976 to 1977.

New tanks, ships and planes contained in the general purpose warfare account would push that category up from $33.4 billion to $40.2 billion in the same period.

Defense officials consider "total obligational authority"—the money available for commitment and expenditure even if it is not actually spent—the most important measure. The fiscal 1977 budget in that category is $112.7 billion compared to $100.1 billion for spending.

Looking ahead, the Pentagon estimated it will need $121.9 billion in hand in fiscal 1981 and would actually spend $113.7 billion that year.

One of the most hotly debated questions in Congress is expected to be what the United States should do after Minuteman in the field of land-based strategic missiles.

Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles targeted on the United States are being made more accurate, Rumsfeld said, and "could threaten the survivability of the Minuteman force within a decade."

The Minuteman is the ocean-spanning ICBM the U.S. Air Force has under tons of concrete in below-ground silos in the West. There are 1,000 of them deployed—550 armed with a cluster of H-bombs rather than just one big warhead.

Rumsfeld said that he would like to avoid building a new generation of land-based missiles to replace the Minuteman.

However, he said that "a continuation of current strategic programs—even within the constraint of SALT (strategic arms limitation talks)—" by the Soviets might give them the ability to knock out the highly accurate Minuteman force, depriving the American President of being able to use them for surgical strikes before resorting to all-out war.

"Our ability to respond to less-than-full-scale attacks in a controlled and deliberate fashion would be severely curtailed" if Soviet missiles keep improving while the United States settles for its present force of Minuteman. "Strategic stability could be endangered," Rumsfeld said.

The new Defense Secretary—who inherited most of the posture statement from Schlesinger—stopped short of recommending a brand new missile building program—a step Pentagon officials said would cost $30 billion over 10 years.

Instead, he told Congress that "we must decide what to do about Minuteman"—making 1976 a crucial year for attempts to control the world's arms race in strategic weapons.

The options for President Ford and the Congress include abandoning efforts to protect fixed targets like Minuteman missiles and putting even more of the American H-bomb arsenal in submarines; pouring more concrete on top of Minuteman silos and putting larger missiles inside them or making the next generation of land-based missiles mobile and therefore harder to hit.

Rumsfeld rejected that first option yesterday.

Without Minuteman to worry about, Rumsfeld argued, the Soviets could concentrate on ways to knock out our other long-range nuclear forces—submarines and bombers.

Also, Rumsfeld said, an ICBM located in a fixed position on the ground offers the President maximum accuracy and control of the missile.

"In a world containing totalitarian and antagonistic powers, vulnerable allies and possible increases in nuclear proliferation," Rumsfeld argued, "the capability for controlled and deliberate responses is essential."

The second option—pouring more concrete on top of the Minuteman silos and putting a new and bigger missile inside—is favored by some Air Force leaders. They envision a missile with an H-bomb in its nose that could blow up Soviet ICBMs in their silos.

FREE TUITION AS PUBLIC POLICY

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, there are many mistakes New York City made in moving in the direction that has caused the fiscal problems which erupted so dramatically on the national scene.

But one of the mistakes for which they have been criticized is not a mistake at all. That is their policy of free tuition in their colleges.

One of these days we are going to become a wise enough Nation to realize that we have to maximize our human potential and we have to encourage young people and older people to take advantage of their potential. The GI bill following World War II was a great example of doing precisely that, an investment in national policy that paid off.

The Nation has been blessed by New York City's no-tuition policy. I was pleased to see in the New York Times an article by Barbara A. Thacher and Edward S. Reid, both former members of the New York City Board of Higher Education, who pointed out the benefits that New York City and the Nation have received from this policy.

The article follows:

FREE TUITION AS PUBLIC POLICY

(By Barbara A. Thacher and Edward S. Reid)

For 128 years New York City has provided higher education for its residents at the lowest possible cost to students. The City University of New York has been for thousands of young people a ramp out of poverty; it has kept many from welfare rolls and moved others off; it has produced a roster of distinguished graduates including four living Nobel laureates. Tax collections from those whose economic circumstances have been bettered by their C.U.N.Y. education amply repay the city's investment.

Tuition charges for public higher education were first imposed in this state under Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller with the expansion of the State University network outside of New York City.

Today in a time of fiscal upheaval the State Regents urge that City University follow suit, substituting tuition at State University of New York levels ($650 to $800) for the modest fees C.U.N.Y. now charges all students (up to $200 in the senior colleges). There are powerful reasons for declining.

More than 80 percent of City University students have net taxable family incomes of under $12,000 a year. (The corresponding figure for the State University is 60 percent, suggesting that tuition, even when mitigated by state aid, is a significant deterrent to low-income students seeking higher education.)

While present state aid-formulas would keep four-fifths of City University students from paying more than they do now, tuitions, like most tolls, inevitably rise, and if the principle of tuition at State University levels is accepted, an effective brake on State University increases will be eliminated.

And, as Dr. Clark Kerr has noted with regard to public tuition increases proposed nationwide by the former Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, of which he was chairman, concern that aid will not keep pace with tuition rises is "a very legitimate fear."

State Education Commissioner Edward B. Nyquist says imposition of formal tuition would make students eligible for additional state aid, increasing by $25 million the funds effectively available to C.U.N.Y. students for each semester.

As others have pointed out, the state contributes $3,300 to each student in a state-supported senior college, but only $1,300 to each C.U.N.Y. full-time undergraduate.

Elimination of such funding discrepancies—which is proposed by the Regents in exchange for the imposition of tuition at C.U.N.Y.—would bring over $200 million in additional state aid to C.U.N.Y., approximately four times as much as the city would save by imposing tuition at C.U.N.Y. levels. Clearly there is room for adjustment without insisting upon the creation of a uniform tuition system.

The tuition burden currently recommended for the City University would fall overwhelmingly upon students from middle-class families earning $12,000 to $20,000 a year in the state's highest cost-of-living area.

The aggregate yield from those best able to pay—families with incomes in excess of $20,000 a year—would be minimal.

The university needs students from every income level if it is to perform its public function; it now serves as the best kind of natural integrating force in higher education, attracting families that might otherwise leave the city, as well as those with limited choices including many from minority groups.

Harnessing C.U.N.Y. with a tuition structure in order to reach that 20 percent of students from families earning over $12,000 would surely not be worth subverting a system of proved value.

It has been New York City's historic mission to receive impoverished migrants, from within the country and abroad, and provide them and their children the education and opportunity to work into the mainsteam of society. Tuition-free higher education, reinforced by open access, recognizes that more than secondary-school training is needed to move ahead today.

As we figure new ways to operate this city, for whom will it be "saved" if not for its citizens? How can they participate in the social process without the understanding and skills to do so?

The concept of free tuition as public policy has served the city well. It has survived attacks from the state in recent years, and economic depression far worse than the current one. If we let ourselves be pushed or panicked into abandoning it now, any savings by the city and state will be far outweighed by costs resulting from wasted ability and lowered achievement.

IMPROVEMENTS IN THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last session I entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD many criticisms concerning the inaccurate nature of the reported debates in the RECORD. As I said on several occasions, these criticisms were not directed to the Government Printing Office or the Official Reporters of Debates, who do extraordinarily good work on our behalf.

I have met with the GPO and the reporters on the proposal to use a distinctively different typeface for inserted material (H.R. 568, 589, 570, 581, and 630) and they have been cooperative and helpful.

The 70-odd House cosponsors of these resolutions felt that a bracket would be more economical than different typeface and agreed with this change proposed by Senator CANNON, the then chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, and Mr. Thomas F. McCormick, the Public Printer. The matter is still before the Joint Committee on Printing. Senator BOB PACKWOOD, author of an identical Senate proposal, and I are meeting with the staff of the Joint Committee and representatives of the GPO in the near future.

I would like to call the attention of the Members to an article in the January 1976 issue of "Government Executive" which indicates that the GPO, under Mr. McCormick, has made significant efforts in improving management, reducing costs, and increasing productivity, including an effort to reduce the number of typefaces:

GPO: AGGRESSIVELY MARKETING THEIR UNIQUE SERVICES

The Government Printing Office, for decades an introverted, sometimes arrogant entity surrounded by a self-generated aura of mysterious controls and authority, is going through a complete reversal in personality.

It is working more effectively with the private sector printing industry, improving its own productivity in large bites and actively seeking out the rest of the federal structure with details on its operations and how to do better with less money.

Part of the change is due to Public Printer Thomas F. McCormick, an experienced executive who is demonstrating an ability to move his organization while capably handling the demands of his overseers, the U.S. Congress.

A cum laude graduate in business from Holy Cross College, a Navy veteran and a veteran of the financial management ladders of General Electric, McCormick was tapped for his current position shortly after a four-year stint running a large G.E. printing subsidiary.

Just prior to joining GPO on March 1, 1973, he was managing G.E.'s Power Generation Strategy Development, concentrating on long-range planning.

In a business where deadlines are routine, McCormick has opened the GPO rapidly—setting up communications links between the organization and all interested outsiders. And his major thrust is to substantially improve government printed media while keeping cost effective.

Much of what GPO does is labor intensive—Congressional hearings, reports, bills and the like.

The two major publications handled by the GPO are the Congressional Record and the Federal Register. "The typesetting for both of these is, on a daily basis, capable of filling the news sections of six daily metropolitan newspapers."

The GPO is the largest hot lead typesetting house in the world. Hundreds of casting machines work out huge volumes daily. But the GPO is moving to electronic and photo composition techniques. They are into optical scanning systems and are continually expanding.

"It is my estimate," says McCormick, "that by 1980 we will have very little hot metal composition in house. There will always be a need for some of this."

And McCormick is anticipating—attrition, retraining and other aspects are constantly examined, in order to move as fairly as possible over the next several years.

McCormick, in the short time he has been aboard GPO, has actively encouraged a host of productivity improvements. Many have come through mechanization and systematizing of lines—again primarily in the movement and distribution of materials.

"We are focusing on productivity, the whole emphasis is on this. There is a great need for it, and, equally, many opportunities."

One approach is in management training—GPO now has an in-house effort and every manager, from top down to first line supervisors have been run through it to acquaint them with the basics of management thinking and techniques.

"We have put together a productivity operation—brought in some new, young people into the comptroller's shop to develop measurement approaches. They have made some significant improvements in some minor areas but hopefully, they will branch out into the major areas—specifically the distribution side of the house where we are filling orders, handling cash, warehousing and other non-printing activities."

Very careful about setting standards, McCormick notes that just the mere developing of productivity measurements has resulted in a productivity rise.

Among other things, GPO is now operating a publications receipt and control system. This system keeps track of all of the GPO's 27,000 items on line and interactively. And with this system, McCormick feels the GPO has pretty good control over its bulk inventory.

The next step is to automate the order fulfillment process so that a complete record is kept, and available, on the status of any order in house.

McCormick is busy broadening both industry and government knowledge of the functions, purpose and moves of the GPO. He regards the attention of the printing industry on GPO as fully legitimate and works with them—through their associations and various organizations.

Though he is involved in it, he says the growing use of more effective graphic design in government printed media is primarily the work of the National Endowment For The Arts and Nancy Hanks.

The GPO has courses on printing production for federal editors and a separate set for designers.

"There is a terrific potential for savings in government printing in standardization," says McCormick, "and the Labor Dept, is a prime example." The idea is to get away from settling in on sizes and formats peculiar to government and so set up these to reflect the ability in the private sector. "It makes it more competitive and has a solid cost cutting effect."

Labor had nearly 50 different trim sizes—which severely limited the GPO's ability to produce or produce publications economically. Labor's plan will result in the use of four basic trim sizes, four typefaces and four types of paper.

There are countless ways to reduce government printing costs and most start right in the originating agency. Early contact with the GPO can be a tremendous help. (So can internal discipline—author's alterations, which is re-writing inside of the printing cycle, cost more than $3.7 million in 1974.)

There is an unkillable myth that the GPO does all government printing or wants to control all government printing.

Actually, almost 70% of the dollar printing volume handled by the GPO is done, under contract, in the private sector. In FY '74 this amounted to more than $222 million and it will be higher in the current year.

McCormick wants to raise the dollar value on individual jobs to allow agencies more leeway in handling small jobs. Anything above a certain amount must go through the GPO—the problem is that inflation and materials costs raises over the years has rendered this lower limit far too low.

As McCormick looks at it, the theory behind a centralized production and/or procurement function is to increase efficiencies. For instance, the GPO's in house production is primarily devoted to Congress. But this has its ups and downs. By having most government printing coming through the GPO, "we can decide, based on our loadings, whether it is more efficient to do it in house or farm it out."

In addition, the GPO has a body of highly skilled printing procurement specialists unmatched by any other government agency. Writing printing specifications is a technical task and it is always costly to the non-expert.

McCormick also sends a team to any agency, on request, to run a one-day seminar on what the GPO is all about. "And the attendees cover all interested parties—not just the editor or the printing specialists."

The seminars, just moving out of the experimental stages, touch on all aspects of the problem—standardization, building in flexibility, late changes, quality control, delivery elements and distribution alternatives.

Even the very basic question as to should there be any printing at all in a specific case is addressed—this is the microform conversion area where moving to film in the first place could create savings, increase communications and still allow the generation of "hard copy" if needed.

Since the late sixties, there has been a growing shift in moving government printing, through the GPO, into the private sector instead of doing it all in-house. McCormick estimates that GPO produces or contracts for about a half billion dollars annually in printing and allied services. "Yet there are over 300 agency printing plants doing an estimated equal amount in dollar volume."

These agency plants are not out of control—they are required to justify their operation periodically before the Joint Committee on Printing.

Because of the drive to move as much printing as economically possible into the private sector, "some hard decisions are coming up, especially with those agencies whose plants have been in existence for a number of years," says McCormick. But there are many of these plants that are easily justifiable because of their highly specialized nature.

"It doesn't take a genius to see that the GPO spends as much time and money moving paper as we do in putting ink on it," says McCormick. So the GPO is planning to relocate—into a new facility which is "designed to allow us to do the work we must do, the in-house work, more effectively and efficiently."

It is not, McCormick stresses, an increase in capability. Rather it is an effort to reduce, or eliminate, much of the flow and housekeeping problems now existing.

"By relocating, we can save $11 million annually in such things as cleaning, guards and materials handling—all administrative costs and nothing to do with printing technology. Yet there is almost another $15 million in annual savings in taking advantage of new printing technology in developing the new plant."

The relocation itself is merely a move of several miles within the District of Columbia to an area which is being developed as an industrial sector. The GPO currently sits in the midst of the new visitor's center complex in D.C. which is swiftly shifting to offices and hotels.

McCormick notes that, in the two years of planning that has already gone into this move, the GSA Public Buildings Service has been tremendously helpful. And there is a very thick environmental impact statement already in being.

SCHOOL BUSING

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the Brown against Board of Education decision in 1954 has been interpreted in two very different ways. One interpretation is that busing can be ordered simply on the grounds that segregation exists. However, the qualitatively different interpretation postulates that the Constitution must be applied in a color-blind fashion to all Americans—that a legal wrong must be proved before a remedy, however socially desirable, may be implemented. In other words, busing may only be ordered under the law where illegal action has resulted in a segregated school district. Clearly, this second interpretation is far more logical and compelling, as the Supreme Court stated in 1974 in its Detroit ruling on Milliken against Bradley, and as my colleague from New York, Mr. RANGEL, pointed out on January 19, of this year.

The background and motivations behind the original Brown case thus became paramount. Only in the years following the High Court's decision did integration become a solution for low minority achievement. As early as 1951 the NAACP approached sociologist Kenneth B. Clark to establish this hypothesis. Clark admitted that psychological and sociological analysis had not yet reached necessary levels of sophistication to split off the effects of segregated schools from other variables in the education process.

Yet, in 1954, only 8 months following Clark's conclusions, "evidence" was presented to the court that has formed the first tenet of what might be called the "integration hypothesis"—that school integration would raise the expectations, morale and achievement of black students. The second tenet of this "integration hypothesis" was based on the contact theory of Gordon Allport—school integration would invariably improve race relations in communities where busing was implemented.

Mr. Speaker, with our 20/20 hindsight we can see clearly that those 1954 assertions were grounded in little quantifiable evidence when originally formulated. More to the point, these same assertions are backed by even less hard evidence today after two decades of experience. Leon Kamin, chairman of Princeton's psychology department, and David Amor, world renowned sociologist, both join Harvard's David K. Cohen in stating with confidence:

> There had been no evidence of the educational impact of desegregation at the time of Brown.

A popular "liberal" program was pressed into action prior to the development of any shred of acceptable evidence that integration helped achieve any desirable education goals.

With all due respect to William Coleman and the fine work he has done, it is now clear that his internationally famous report of 1966 extended in an inappropriate fashion the issue of forced integration out of the South where de jure segregation was the problem. When the Court ordered busing in the South, the prohibition extended to actions by Southern States which legislated mandatory dual school systems for blacks and whites. This de jure education segregation should not be confused with the de facto condition of racial imbalance which existed in the North—the Supreme Court simply did not refer to school segregation caused by segregated neighborhoods. Compounding this error, the Coleman report intentionally shifted the ground from equal opportunity to equal results. Finally, the Coleman report casually slipped in the following assertion:

> If a minority pupil . . . is put with schoolmates with strong educational backgrounds, his achievement is likely to increase.

Henry S. Dyer, of the Educational Testing Service, writing in the Harvard Educational Review in 1968, was one of the first of a long line of experts to criticize Coleman for this last allegation:

> There is nothing whatever in the Coleman report that can justify such an inference.

Perhaps even more damaging was the criticism of Coleman's quantitative methodology. His utilization of cross sectional data—test scores taken from all types of pupils at the same time—has been severely criticized as an invalid method of hypothesis testing. The accepted procedure is the use of longitudinal analysis—measuring the performance of different types of students over time.

Mr. Speaker, due to a general misconception of the Coleman data by journalists, civic, business and church leadership as well as national legislators—a misconception founded in the optimism that a solution to the problem of educational inequalities had finally been isolated—the educational goal of equality of opportunity became translated into a goal of equality of educational results. Biloine Whiting Young, Illinois, and Grace Billings Bress, Harvard, writing for the Phi Delta Kappan in 1974, forcefully concluded:

> This shift in goals led directly to the massive busing programs undertaken in our major cities.

And thus, the present situation is put into proper perspective. Where do these theories stand today? From 1970 to the present virtually every study published on forced busing to achieve integration concluded that without a shadow of a doubt neither tenet of the widely accepted "integration hypothesis" holds any relevance today.

Mr. Speaker, the proven reality that the stated rationale for busing—increased achievement for blacks and better race relations—has not and cannot be realized through compulsory busing seems to me to be a logically compelling argument against further systematic use of compulsory busing to achieve such goals.

The following documentation is provided as a sampler of the new wisdom:

David Armor—The Public Interest, 1972:

> Induced integration did not raise minority achievement and in fact, increased tensions and conflict.

Jeffrey Leech—Indiana Law Review, 1973:

> Busing to achieve racial integration may in fact produce no educational gains, may hinder the psychological development of black children, and may intensify racial misunderstanding.

Tom Wicker—New York Times, 1974:

> There is little evidence to show that the education test scores of minority children have been improved in those districts that have been integrated.

David K. Cohen—Society, 1974:

> Evidence on the educational impact of Brown began to flow in as schools integrated. Sometimes it showed modest gains and sometimes it showed no change over expectations, but it never showed that desegregated schools came close to eliminating achievement differences between blacks and whites.

Biloine Whiting Young and Grace Billings Bress—Phi Delta Kappan, 1974:

> At least two major studies, the Carnegie Commission's and the New York Times; reported increased racial hostility, intimidation and violence in racially balanced schools throughout the country.

Nancy St. John—Integrated Education, 1972:

Children of low socioeconomic status (black and white) can expect to be academically and socially threatened by desegregation. . . . In their (social scientists, lawyers and educators) zeal for one valued principle, they often ignore others and forget that integration, however important, is only one component of quality education, and not necessarily, for all children at all stages, the most important component.

Norman Cousins—Saturday Review, 1976:

Busing hasn't worked. . . . Busing is leading away from integration and not towards it; [the evidence tends to suggest] that it has not significantly improved the quality of education accessible to blacks; that it has lowered the standard of education available to whites; that it has resulted in the exodus of white students to private schools inside the cities or to public schools in the comparatively affluent suburbs beyond the means of the blacks; and finally, that it has not contributed to racial harmony but has produced deep fissures within American society.

Nathan Glazer—Commentary, 1972:

Much integration through transportation has been so disappointing in terms of raising achievement that it may well lead to a reevaluation of the earlier research [Coleman] whose somewhat tenuous results raised what begin to look like false hopes. . . . If, then, judges are moving toward a forcible reorganization of American education because they believe this will improve relations between the races, they are acting neither on evidence nor on experience but on faith.

Mr. Speaker, these experts' credentials speak for themselves. There is little I could add to highlight the uniformity of opinion that busing in no way lives up to its false billings. Clearly, the years since Brown have resulted in greater opportunities for some blacks—those able to move into the middle class. But I find myself forced to argue along with Young and Bress, among others, that schools have given up trying to equalize upwards—instead they are equalizing downwards. Bress and Young noted that some school districts in New York City have eliminated all courses in subjects such as calculus and enriched English on the grounds that they would not have "the correct racial balance."

Even more alarming is the phenomenon some call "resegregation." This process involves the middle class parents of both black and white students removing their children from the integrated environment and placing them in private schools or in schools in the suburbs. The final result is an increase in the racial imbalance in the city schools—the same imbalance that the well-intended reformers attempted to remove. Our colleague JOE MOAKLEY provided us with figures from the U.S. census and the Boston Board of Education at the Democratic Caucus meeting on the proposed constitutional amendment prohibiting busing just 3 months ago. The figures are startling enough to give each and every one of us the flavor of the destructive phenomenon we call resegregation. In 1973 Boston's school system was 37 percent nonwhite. In 1975 it was 56 percent nonwhite. These startling percentage changes took place in a city which is still 81 percent white.

In 1968, 72.1 percent of minority students in the New York State public school system attended schools whose composition was more than half minority. In 1974 that figure rose to more than 75 percent. Further, Young and Bress reported in 1974 that half of the black and Hispanic children in New York attend schools that are over 90 percent minority. New York City spent $70 million on busing in 1974 to achieve this "balance."

Particularly disturbing is the behavior of probusing forces which uniformly tend to ignore examples that run counter to their arguments. Thomas Sowell, a black economist, drew the Nation's attention to Dunbar High School right here in Washington. For 85 years Dunbar has consistently placed first in citywide tests for achievement. Dunbar produced the Nation's first black general, our first black Cabinet member, and the discoverer of blood plasma. The first black Senator since Reconstruction was a Dunbar graduate. It is illuminating that Dunbar High School is an all black segregated high school. Race was an irrelevant factor in Dunbar's incredible success story; what was important was the motivation toward excellence.

Life is full of ironies, but it seems that our busing epic has more than its share. For example, Kenneth Clark, the original sociologist arguing for integration to increase black achievement, now claims:

Courts and political bodies . . . should decide questions of school spending and integration not on the basis of uncertain research findings, but on the basis of constitutional and equity rights of all human beings regardless of color.

Norman Cousins, the liberal's liberal, wrote just yesterday:

Busing hasn't desegregated the schools. It has resegregated them . . . Some 30 percent of white families have moved to the suburbs, leaving many northern cities with predominantly black schools.

And most revealing of all, William Coleman writes:

Ironically, desegregation may be increasing segregation. . . . The achievement benefits of integrated schools appeared substantial when I studied them in the mid 1960's, but subsequent studies of achievement in actual systems that have desegregated . . . have found smaller effects, and in some cases none at all.

Mr. Speaker, we have come full circle. The very experts upon whom we relied just 10 years ago have bowed to the massive weight of evidence that has been presented since 1966. Any supporter of court-ordered busing in the 1960's would quote Clark and Coleman as the literal gospel mandating integration. In 1976, Clark and Coleman have backtracked and admitted that the evidence does not support busing as the solution of educational inequality or educational segregation.

My colleagues and I, being forced to face the reality that busing to eliminate segregation will in all probability neither raise black achievement nor ease racial tensions, must weigh anew the costs and benefits of busing to achieve integration. The benefits upon examination appear to be only cosmetic. The costs are very clear and very dear.

Assuming that there remain enough whites in the major cities to integrate—a very dubious assumption at best—the results seem to be a lowering of educational quality for the blacks and whites, with lower achievement for the whites and stationary achievement for the blacks. Racial tensions seem to increase along with the development of an environment where all students are forced to fail—fail to the degree that they will not learn to their full potential, be they black or white.

The implementation of busing as a solution to the discriminatory environment in the United States is just another case of trying to melt the tip of the iceberg in order to insure safe passage for the Titanic. The condition of the minority groups in America is the fundamental challenge confronting us. As Cousins points out—

Everything involved in lifting a people out of their low state in society—housing, health, economic opportunity, nutrition, access to justice under the law—fits into this total challenge.

We should not feel embarassed in having failed in this one social program. The culpable error is in refusing to step back and honestly reexamine the issue in light of accumulating new evidence. Support of busing in this day and age, with all of the evidence before us, is an abuse of the public trust. The abuse is compounded when, at one and the same time that New York City spends $70 million a year on a busing program with no identifiable educational or learning payoffs, vital and time-tested educational programs such as adult education, enriched English, intensive foreign language study and evening classes have all been axed.

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am initiating a congressional request for a White House Conference on Compulsory Busing. This afternoon, I am sending a telegram to President Ford with this request. In addition, I am introducing the following joint resolution to the Congress:

Joint resolution calling for a White House Conference to evaluate the busing experience of the United States over the past two decades.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President shall announce and convene a White House Conference to evaluate the success of compulsory busing to achieve integration in equalizing educational opportunity and to reassess the role of forced busing in improving the relative lot of disadvantaged Americans and to issue a comprehensive report including policy recommendations for alternative positive steps for equalizing educational opportunity and providing excellence in education for all Americans.

This Conference should openly examine the busing experience and propose alternative plans for improving the condition of all the disadvantaged citizen in the United States. In reality, this was the intention of the busing supporters of the 1950's and 1960's. Their tool has been proven ineffectual and innocuous at best, harmful and counter productive at worst. It will be the challenge of the White House Conference in 1976 to forge the workable programs which will make a reality of the decent hopes and high intentions of the 1950's and 1960's.

TAXATION WITH CONSULTATION

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there have been all sorts of suggestions on what to do with the 36-page, 1976 Federal income tax form 1040 which arrived in the mails right after Christmas to mar the holiday spirits of millions of Americans. Some of these are not repeatable, others are. One excellent idea from Arlington, Va., would let the taxpayers tell the Federal Government how they want their tax dollars spent. The following column by Colman McCarthy, which appeared in the January 26 edition of Newsweek magazine, elaborates on this fine proposal.

TAX MONEY FOR WHAT?

(By Colman McCarthy)

The 1975 income-tax forms arrived in the mailbox the day after Christmas. Exquisite timing, IRS. But what is more offensive than that is the form itself. I don't mean the 36 pages of the 1040 that even the IRS, in a burst of unavoidable crust, admits is "more complex than last year's." Complexity can be justified. What can't be, though, is an offensiveness that goes deeper, directly to the emotions of the citizens and to the meaning of participatory democracy: there is no desire by the government to learn what the citizen wants his money used for, or not used.

The government takes our money—period. To the IRS mind, this works out to a neat balance: the government doesn't know where the money comes from and the citizens don't know where it goes. This unaccountability that the Federal government builds in for itself is at the heart of why so many citizens are angered, disillusioned or uncaring about their servants in Washington. But some citizens persist in caring. With this in mind, I would like to elaborate on an idea that an Arlington, Va., woman named Renee Henninger is talking about among her neighbors. It is simple, quick, comprehensive: the IRS tax form would include in its pages a section where the citizen can express his priorities. A possible format would be this: "Enter below the ten ways you most desire the Federal government to spend the money that it is now taxing you."

YEAS AND NAYS

The citizen would itemize his choices. The wording would have to be brief to make it chewable by the computer; tirades, sermons and threats would only jam the machine and give the IRS an excuse to say the priorities list is too troublesome. Following his ten positive choices would be another list: ten ways in which the citizen does not want his money spent.

The purposes of these expressions of taxpayer preferences are both political and practical. Politically (the Greek *politeia* means the state of being a citizen), it is a voicing of sentiments at the one moment—when the pocketbook is being squeezed—when feelings ride high to express those sentiments. Americans are told to express their views at the ballot box, but more and more people are not bothering to vote. Why should they? Often the November elections offer choices between mediocrities, demeaning citizens seeking excellence.

Polls are said to be an expression of the citizen's voice, but they are small samplings and too many people are suspicious of them. The IRS tax form is the one steady lightning rod down which the citizen can send the government a bolt of personal feeling: here is my money, this is what I want for it. With income-tax forms being filled out by 95 per cent of all Americans including their dependents, an invaluable opportunity exists to learn definitely about public sentiment. The results would be headline national news. We would have no more guessing about "the mood of America," however much this would force the columnists to exceptions for new material on slow days.

LAYING IT ON THE LINE

If large parts of the population are hostile or indifferent to the government, it is not because Big Brother tells the little man what to do, but because Big Brother does what he wants regardless of the little man. What does the stupid citizen know about the need to stop the Russians in Angola? What does the ignorant little man know about the need for more weapons in the arms race? It is the supreme government that knows, not the lightweight governed.

The IRS priorities survey would put an end to that. With precise information coming from the bottom to the top, the top would be held accountable for the way America's money is spent. We would have accurate knowledge of how many citizens want or don't want their taxes given to such expenses as mass transit, national health insurance, welfare, low-cost housing, libraries, missiles, C–5A airplanes, the CIA and the FBI, alternatives to prison, park lands, abortion clinics, schools, hospitals, tobacco subsidies and so on. If the citizens choose to allot their wages for the Angolas of the world, then let it be determined, so at least there is an end to the government preaching to us that it acts only "in the national interest." As an aid to those citizens who may need help in getting their juices going—though small chance exists for this—the IRS should be required to put in the tax forms the 30 or 40 leading Federal expenses.

Has such a proposal a chance? The odds are against it, at least for now. The IRS isn't likely to be enthused. It recently resisted allowing even four tiny questions to be added to the 1975 form about where the taxpayers live. The purpose of the questions was to get more specific facts as an aid to better allocation of Federal revenue-sharing funds. But that means *giving* to the people, not taking, so the IRS resisted. But the major opposition will likely come from the policy experts in the government. Many of them maintain their bureaucratic empires by spending vast amounts of citizen money on what they, and they alone, see as "the public good." These experts—in the Office of Management and Budget, but elsewhere too—have no desire to hear from the citizens; the latter can be messy, and they have a history of upsetting the established way, even the one on which the experts keep congratulating themselves as the happy American way.

THERE'S GOT TO BE A LAW

Should the idea of a priorities survey ever get into the tax forms, it will probably do so by a law. That means Congress will get its chance to maul the idea, as it has mauled to death so many other ideas that have come up from the people. But hope is strong now because never before have so many politicians been saying that government is unresponsive, remote and self-serving. Those in the government find it fashionable to be agin-the-government. If so, we need to know what the governed want for themselves—not what Gallup or Harris say they want, or Gerald Ford, Henry Kissinger, politicians, candidates, bureaucrats, experts or editorial writers. It is likely that all but a few citizens would be passionately eager to express themselves on the tax form. It is in the old American tradition of a person putting his mouth where his money is.

DADE JETPORT

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, an article recently appeared in the Miami Herald regarding the Dade County Jetport. Since Congress will ultimately be called upon to provide funds for site acquisition, I would like to take this time to bring this article to my colleagues' attention.

There is currently a training jetport north of Everglades National Park on the Dade-Collier County line. When it appeared that the needs of the Greater Miami area might require construction of a new commercial airport, the training jetport site was considered likely to be developed. However, there were great fears that such an expanded facility would cause severe damage to the delicate ecology of the Everglades. Accordingly, the county, the State of Florida, and the Departments of Transportation and the Interior agreed, in the Everglades Jetport Pact of 1970, that the county would select an alternate location and that, with the approval of the other parties, the new site would be acquired with total Federal funding. During the site selection process, and now, during the approval process for site 14 in northwest Dade County, training flights have continued at the Glades Jetport.

Since 1970, however, there have been a number of significant changes in the situation, as the article points out in detail. A study discussed in the article states that operation of the present site in the Everglades has not produced any evidence of environmental damage in 4 years, nor would similar training operations cause any damage at site 14. Development of full commercial airport facilities at either site, however, would cause extensive damage to ecosystems. Nevertheless, the study also indicates that it is questionable that the Miami area will actually need a new commercial airport until close to the end of the century. Why, then, spend an additional $69 million, over four times the original price of the Glades facility, to acquire a new site?

I hope the members of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations will take these factors into consideration when the time comes to act on the $69 million request, and will prevent this waste of Federal funds on the acquisition of site 14 for a new Dade County training jetport.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

STUDY: TRAINING JETPORT WON'T HURT

(By Don Bedwell)

South Florida's environment would not suffer from the construction and operation of a new training jetport in northwest Dade County, according to a voluminous impact study just completed on the $69 million project.

And, despite the outcries that forced county officials to seek a replacement site for its existing training facility north of Everglades National Park, the new study

concludes that four years of flight operations there have not damaged the wilderness.

The proposed 23-square-mile training complex on the Broward line at U.S. 27 "will have no significant effect on the South Florida ecosystem as a whole," summarizes the study.

A training facility alone, it states, would cause "no significant noise impact" on populated areas, would have "no appreciable effect on water flow to Everglades Park and would disturb less than 700 of the site's 8,819 acres.

A full-blown commercial airport at that location—which the study suggests wouldn't be needed until near the year 2000—is projected to have more far-reaching ecological consequences.

The impact study—379 pages long with a 115-page appendix—carries the support of Dade County, the State of Florida and the U.S. Departments of Interior and Transportation.

Copies of the document can be reviewed by the public at the FAA and Dade Aviation Department offices at Miami International Airport, the Broward aviation director's office and Broward Planning Council offices in Fort Lauderdale and at most Dade libraries and the Miramar library.

A joint federal-state-county site team selected the northwest Dade tract as an alternate location for the Everglades jetport, a facility opened in 1970 in a compromise between Dade's Aviation Department, which built it, and federal agencies and conservationists who considered it a threat to the park and the South Florida water supply.

Through the 1970 Jetport Pact, federal officials allowed the training runway to open temporarily for airline pilots practicing touch-and-go landings. Dade agreed in that pact to operate the strip only until a less-sensitive tract could be found and acquired, at no cost to the county.

The FAA currently is processing a county application for a $69 million federal grant to acquire the new site, construct a runway and land-bank the remaining acreage for possible development later into a commercial airfield.

According to the new study, any development beyond the single runway at the northwest Dade site—"whether it be one additional runway or the ultimate potential development"—would have to meet all local and federal environmental laws and be acceptable to the secretary of transportation.

Dade's application for federal funds has proven to be a hot potato because of the new site's cost, four times that of the larger Everglades tract that was developed before speculators and inflation could take their toll.

It also promises to be controversial because airline training operations at the existing runway, after peaking at 100,000 in 1972, have steadily declined to a low of 22,000 last year. Training flights are being reduced as airlines rely ever more on ground simulators to conserve fuel.

Thus, Congress ultimately will be asked to chip in $69 million to replace a facility that cost just $15 million and which, according to the study isn't causing any ecological damage where it is.

After four years of flight operations, "there has been no evidence of environmental change in the vicinity of the present training facility," the new study concludes.

Many of the warnings voiced in the late 1960s, though, were directed not at the training operation but at the feared disruption that could result from a fully developed commercial airport in the wilderness.

The study acknowledges that the construction of such an airport at the northwest Dade site could disturb almost 5,000 acres, destroy entire wildlife and plant communities and wreak other damage.

And, it adds, full-scale development could force the soundproofing of two elementary schools, three churches and two hospitals east of the field.

The study summarizes that acquiring that tract and building a runway will bring about "a relatively short period of disturbance to the environment in a limited and essentially controlled area."

In return, "it will establish a land bank and facilities capable of handling potential aviation needs past the year 2000."

PRESIDENT VERSUS VETERANS

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the December 1975, issue of the Veterans of Foreign Wars magazine includes an editorial by VFW Commander-in-Chief Thomas C. Walker which reveals a shocking unconcern, for the welfare of those who have honorably served our country, by the President and his top advisers. The VFW is concerned not only by the administration's failure to act on such necessary programs as improving Veterans' Administration hospitals, but on the dangerous foreign policy maneuvers with regard to the Panama Canal and relations with Communist Cuba.

I recommend the VFW positions for the attention of my colleagues:

PRESIDENT VERSUS VETERANS

(By Thomas C. Walker, VFW Commander-in-Chief)

(The VFW has requested an audience with President Ford to discuss the issues cited here and others equally important. The VFW has been refused the courtesy of presenting the mandates of the delegates to the National Convention. The President's aides have either ignored or failed to be receptive to the VFW's efforts. Recently, the VFW declined an invitation issued on two days' notice to 16 other veterans' organizations to meet with the President. Participating in such a mass gathering would have been a disservice to the 1.8 million members of the VFW. President Ford is the first Chief Executive in more than 40 years who has not met on a one-to-one basis with the VFW Commander-in-Chief to discuss veterans' problems. He also has failed to invite the Buddy Poppy girl to the White House. We believe we speak for not only our membership, but also the great majority of the 29 million living veterans, their widows and orphans.)

Recently, it has become evident that advice given the President of the United States has been causing the loss of veterans programs and rights.

It is time each veteran knows what is happening. To do less—to sit quietly by and watch our programs be eroded, cut and lost—would be an injustice to the veteran and his widow.

Item: The President requested that compensation payments for service-connected disabilities be held to 5%. In view of the increase in the cost-of-living, this was a slap in the face to the man who fought for his country, was wounded and disabled.

Item: The President is attempting to hold proposals to increase a veterans pension to 5%. The 8% Social Security increase of July would cut or eliminate hundreds of thousands of veterans and widows from the rolls if this proposal is passed.

Item: A recent survey showed that pensioners over age 72 were not getting along on their present pension. The President's Veterans Administration attempted to "whitewash" this report by saying that the program was in good shape.

Item: There is a crying need for a revision in the present pension program. Veterans need an income that will allow them to live above the poverty level and with dignity. The President's Director of the Office of Management and Budget tells us there will be a cut in veterans programs next year.

Item: Veterans need a place for an honorable burial in a National Cemetery if they so desire. The President's Veterans Administration has had the cemetery program for two years and has not opened one new gravesite during that time.

Item: It took this President months to read and act on the Survey of VA hospitals. An attempt to patch up the flaws is being made. Pray it is not too late.

Item: The 76th National V.F.W. Convention was the first in many years at which neither the President nor Vice President appeared to address the delegates.

Item: The President vetoed the GI Bill education assistance increase which would primarily benefit Vietnam veterans. It brings much more back to the country in taxes alone than it costs.

Item: The President vetoed an increase in travel payments for disabled veterans. He approved the increase for other government people. Apparently, it costs them more to travel than a wounded veteran.

Item: The President expresses concern for the unemployed and handicapped veteran, yet many of the federal agencies have not implemented regulations to employ these veterans.

Item: The President established a "clemency board." Four members of that board charge that full Presidential "pardons" were given. This makes a deserter or repeated AWOL offender eligible to buy a gun, hold political office or be a member of the V.F.W.

Item: Detente has been a policy disaster for America, confusing and dividing our allies and our own people. We have traded U.S. technology and agricultural products for televised news pictures of the President and his Secretary of State toasting "peace." We, today, are the second strongest power in the world in a contest where our very survival is at stake.

Item: The United States Canal, located on the Isthmus of Panama, is being recklessly offered up to a leftwing dictatorship incapable of either protecting or operating our strategic jugular vein in the Western Hemisphere. A part of America, as American as Alaska, Hawaii, or Grand Rapids, Mich., is being put on the block simply because an authoritarian Panamanian brigadier general seeks to hold power by grasping something he never created or owned. And the national Administration is the giveaway artists. The Soviets haven't even asked us to do this.

Item: An Administration that apparently knows the price of everything and the value of nothing is seeking to end the armed forces' commissary stores, the Defense Department-funded GI educational benefits as a recruiting inducement and the civilian medical program, but still unrealistically hopes to assure the success of an all volunteer military force. The draft has ended, but now the Administration will not give our armed forces the tools needed to succeed.

Item: Equipment badly needed by our own forces soon will be furnished to both sides of the Arab-Israeli dispute. This is cynical blank check payouts in the foolish hope of buying peace.

Item: "Normalization" of relations with Communist China and Castro's Cuba takes clear policy precedence over a sturdy assertion of American interests and unapologetic

support for allies who have stood with us in the past.

The Soviet Union respects only power. The Soviets call it "objective correlation of forces." Before this global challenge, this Administration offers only transparent words and business-as-usual.

In short, it appears not only is our beloved country being hurt, but so is the man who answered its call.

These and other matters are the things we had hoped to discuss with the President. We feel that they are sufficiently important to the nation and those who fought for their beloved country.

There is a move to cut and eliminate veterans programs and rights.

The V.F.W. is mandated to fight these injustices. Let no one—President or veteran—fail us in our time of need.

As a former President said, "The nation which forgets its veterans, will itself be forgotten."

TIME TO FACE REALITY ON NATURAL GAS

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, we will soon be taking up the question of deregulation of prices on new natural gas supplies. For many Members of Congress this is a difficult decision, since we are faced with voting for a possible increase in consumer prices in the short term to assure the long-term availability of this environmentally desirable and economically essential fuel.

The difficulty is not because the American people, given the factual situation, would not choose to have natural gas, and the jobs which depend upon it, even at a slight increase in price, the difficulty arises because there are those, including Members of this body, who prefer to tell people what they wish to hear rather than the less politically attractive facts of the case.

Fortunately, the reality of the situation is increasingly clear to the electorate and much of the media, who are not being misled by demagoguery or wishful thinking. Our economic future and our ability to provide the jobs needed by our work force, particularly in New England, are dependent on our taking this action to assure the natural gas supplies we need, now and in the future.

I would like to offer for inclusion in the RECORD this excellent editorial from the Hartford, Conn. Times, a leading newspaper in Connecticut and a voice of reason and responsibility regarding our energy needs:

KRUEGER-BROYHILL BILL IS ESSENTIAL TO THE NATION

The Congress upon its return to Washington next week will find itself confronted with yet another opportunity to take meaningful action to resolve the nation's energy crisis: Deregulation of new natural gas supplies.

The Congress failed disastrously in its last attempt to resolve the energy crisis when it enacted the national energy bill, insuring continued shortages of petroleum, perhaps severe shortages, indefinitely.

There are two proposals on natural gas now before the Congress. One, the "Dingell Bill," or Natural Gas Emergency Act of 1975, would provide no solution to the natural gas industry's problems and would, in fact, make the problems considerably more severe over the long run by functioning as a disincentive for natural gas exploration and development. The other, the "Krueger-Broyhill Natural Gas Bill," which is a companion to legislation already enacted by the Senate, would deregulate new gas sales at the wellhead for on-shore production immediately and would establish a Federal Power Commission price authority over off-shore production on federal lands for a term of only six years, thus insuring that industry would be provided with the incentive essential to insure exploration for and development of natural gas supplies.

Adoption of the Krueger-Broyhill Natural Gas Bill is critical to the nation's future energy security and it must be enacted.

When the Congress enacted the disastrous national energy bill regulating petroleum, United States Senator Lowell Weicker was prompted to call it "a dishonest piece of legislation." He said it "fails on every count. While we need to reduce consumer demand, the bill steers clear of mandatory conservation and offers 40 more months of price controls, rewarding consumption. While we need to increase supply, there is little incentive for more energy production. Instead, we establish artificial prices on oil that are entirely unrealistic."

The same danger now exists for the nation's natural gas industry, which already is experiencing critical shortages resulting in serious curtailments that in some areas of the country already have meant the loss of employment.

The nation's future energy security is far too critical an issue to be affected adversely by political gamesmanship, yet that is exactly what happened with the legislation regulating petroleum prices: Congressmen and Senators did not want to see petroleum prices affecting basics like gasoline and electricity increase during an election year, choosing instead to continue a policy insuring disincentives for exploration and development for at least 40 more months.

The Krueger-Broyhill proposal would confront the immediate crisis, this winter and next winter, by permitting 180-day emergency purchases by curtailed interstate pipelines to meet the need of high priority customers; would permit emergency conversions of natural gas boilers on a short-term basis with compensation to the affected user, and would permit short-term allocation and price controls on propane, with appropriate directions to protect high priority users.

But most important, it would deal with the long-range problem by decontrolling new gas prices at the wellhead to stimulate the exploration and development essential to insuring continued essential supplies of energy.

There is no real natural gas "shortage" in the United States, a fact that American consumers must understand. Natural gas is available in sufficient quantities to meet the nation's demand for the next 35 to 65 years—and those estimates are conservative. The gas must be located, however, and then it must be developed. Wells must be drilled and pipelines must be constructed. The cost of exploration and development to bring those supplies to the nation's consumers will be astronomical.

Under the existing regulatory legislation, it too often is not economically feasible for natural gas suppliers to explore for and develop potential reserves: Deregulation would resolve that problem by allowing the price consumers pay to rise to the actual level of cost incurred in exploration for and development of the new resources.

The Krueger-Broyhill proposal has a six-fold purpose: To alleviate, to the extent possible, natural gas emergencies this winter; to increase supplies of new natural gas for the benefit of the American consumer; to protect the consumer against inflationary price increases for gas presently flowing in interstate commerce; to assure efficient allocations of dwindling natural gas supplies to high priority residential and agricultural usages until the gas shortage is alleviated; to inhibit the demand for natural gas consumption in boilers when alternate fuels can be obtained reasonably, and to authorize collection of comprehensive data on natural gas supplies, production, transportation, sale and consumption.

Those are primarily long-term objectives. The Dingell Natural Gas Emergency Act of 1975 would deal only with the short-term problems of this winter and next winter, with the result that exploration for and development of new supplies will be delayed for at least two more years—at untold cost to American consumers.

Connecticut Natural Gas Corporation has estimated that state residents in that single company's franchise area will save $22.5 million if the Krueger-Broyhill bill is selected over the Dingell proposal. That is the difference annually between the cost of importing natural gas and using synthetic gas over the cost that consumers would bear if deregulation became a reality.

Consumers would actually save millions each and every year in Connecticut if decontrol becomes a reality. Higher costs to consumers would result from curtailments requiring acquisition of natural and synthetic gas from outside sources rather than from developing new domestic resources.

The Krueger-Broyhill proposal must be adopted in the House of Representatives. The Senate already has enacted a similar proposal. The nation's consumers have far too much to lose if the Congress is again allowed to cop-out rather than confront the harsh realities involved in stimulating new exploration and development.

A "solution" to the natural gas crisis must not be allowed to follow in the same manner as the "solution" the Congress has imposed upon the nation to deal with petroleum shortages.

FIRING LINES, PART II

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as I have previously noted in the RECORD, I plan to offer an amendment to the military aid bill now before the International Relations Committee which would outlaw the "covert action" functions of the Central Intelligence Agency and restrict future Agency operations to the gathering and analysis of intelligence. For now, I would like to continue to bring background material on this important issue to the attention of my colleagues.

Earlier this week, I began the insertion of a thoughtful article by Garry Wills that appeared in the January 22 issue of The New York Review of Books. In part II, which is excerpted below, Mr. Wills examines the key characteristics of the "secret agent" mentality:

THE CIA FROM BEGINNING TO END

II

Just as other empires were dissolving, America was coming into its own. We tried

to take up some of the old imperial tasks, in Indochina and the Congo. But mainly we thought of ourselves as a new thing, an anti-empire. We meant to check, wherever it arose—indigenously, by outside inspiration, or both—every movement toward communism, which we conceived as a monolithic empire growing up all around us (and maybe in our midst). This called for intelligence operations even more extensive and ambitious than those of the conventional empire.

For one thing they would have no defined sphere of interest, no specific network of colonies to protect. Every place was a potential communist colony, and therefore a target for preventive action on our part. We had to *foresee* communist action in order to block it. And since this was a war for the minds of men, even ideas were enemies to be countered. That is why ideological training and purity were needed, to supplant older ties of mere patriotic national interest, professional pride, or material reward.

Everything in spy work depends on judging the reliability, first, of one's own employees and their catspaws (agents). Allen Dulles made ideological orthodoxy the main qualification for a CIA man: "The ideological volunteer, if he is sincere, is a man whose loyalty you need rarely question, as you must always question the loyalties of people who work chiefly for money or out of a desire for adventure and intrigue."

There is something puzzling about Dulles's emphasis on ideological conformity in the CIA. At a cold-war time when all of America was in the grip of rigid anticommunism, the CIA had the reputation among knowledgeable people of being a free and enlightened refuge for the least timorous. Those opposed, say, to the House Committee on Un-American Activities tended to be admirers of the CIA. They rejoiced in the skill that kept the Agency outside Joe McCarthy's reach. How on earth do you explain a society in which the secret police are the last guardians of men's freedom? The situation is so odd that it deserved study on a scale made impossible by the Agency's discipline of secrecy. CIA defenders have a point when they say that recent investigations take the Agency at a time in its career when it is unfairly judged. What it was doing in the Nixon era looked typical of that degraded time; but what it was doing in the McCarthy period looked, to those who knew what was going on, very atypical. How explain that?

Well, for a start, from the genealogy of CIA—out of MI–6 by way of OSS. The secret of disciplining free spirits in a shadowy elite corps was passed on from a dying imperialism to a nascent one. The first OSS teams were trained in Canada.

Terminology was taken over, along with tactics—e.g., "special operations" for covert activities. There was competition and resentment too, just as in Buckley's tale of a Queen sadistically "banged" even as she is saved. But, for all its attempts at correction of the imperial model, the OSS ended up mimicking its tutor-rival. This shows in all three areas considered above—those which tended to make the spy a Clubman, Colonizer, and Coriolanus.

1) *Clubman.* The OSS was a "well-born" crew, according to the Alsop-Braden book, *Sub Rosa.*[1] It was the place where college professors got back together with their brighter (or wealthier) students during the war. Paul Mellon and his brother-in-law, David Bruce, served there along with J. P. Morgan's sons, a duPont, and C. Douglas Dillon. Commissions came easy (one in every four OSS personnel were officers) and regular army discipline was rather ostentatiously ignored. Since the OSS wanted glib operators in both gray and black propaganda for MO (Morale Operations), it nursed the infant "Madison Avenue"—the J. Walter Thompson advertising agency gave it a European director (Kenneth Hinks) and ended up with men in charge of the OSS Planning Staff, the London MO branch, the Casablanca MO branch, and the Cairo office. The advertising men got back from the organization a future vice-president, Richard de Rochemont. No wonder the Thompson types on Nixon's staff later expected (and got) a few courtesies from CIA, the OSS descendant.

The elite spirit of the OSS extended even more forcibly to the early CIA. OSS was a refuge for some of the privileged who had to go to war, as well as for the mobile university faculties of wartime. But CIA thought of itself as the same kind of organization purified by pace. Those who renewed their service in the later agency could have wealth and position in society; but they chose obscure, dangerous, and ill-paid service to their country. What little credit they got must come from their peers. Today we hear veterans of that regime lament the unsung heroes, whose very decorations from the government were of a secret sort to begin, with and could not be worn or displayed despite their unrecognizability. The links forged were unrecognizability. The links forged were fairly mystical. Buckley tries to convey the feeling in his novel:

There's a funny incorporealized solidarity out there. You don't know who they are, but you *do* know that you are all straining to achieve the same end, and a day comes when their invisible forms are as palpable as the members of your swimming team.

There was a prolongation and intensification of both schoolboy and wartime emotions. A wealthy ex-OSS man who knew Howard Hunt during the war offered money to his defense, even though he disapproved of his more recent activities. One does not let the swimming team down. And this was not even a CIA member—just part of the prior organization. The gesture makes us understand the loyalty that made Tom Braden call a dinner in honor of Richard Helms when Congress had "forced" him into apparent perjury. Toasts were made by Robert McNamara and Averell Harriman, and drunk by Henry Kissinger. It was the real-life equivalent of Buckley's hero being cheered in secret for refusing to cooperate with Congress. (The fact that Buckley takes this position after his defense of Joe McCarthy and his assault on "Fifth-Amendment" non-cooperation with Congress shows just how overriding are ties with the Agency when competing moral claims come into play.)

The CIA became America's mystery elite for twenty years, the only agency loved by both right and left. Its employees ordered ambassadors around. The organization's very secrecy made it difficult to know how high any officer really was in the service. Any man might be a Bones brother in disguise. Field officers often had money to throw around—Howard Hunt's account of the Bay of Pigs operation (*Give Us This Day*, Arlington House, 1973) shows how powerfully self-seductive that kind of cash is: Hunt was the patron, sorting out precedence among rival Cuban factions by the way he sluiced US money to each group's spokesmen. He affects regret that plausible "cover" made it necessary for him to live in such high style; but his spy tales show how important this extravagance can be to the job's appeal. Even danger sheds its glamour. And danger mixed with money is aphrodisiac. Hunt's heroes, like Ian Fleming's, get the prettiest girl in the casino. Buckley's hero, Blackford, has to travel better-class—he "penetrates" the Queen of England, after elaborately playing on that technical term from the outset. Spying is supposed to be sexy, and some spies labor to maintain that view, as pornographers dutifully cultivate a taste for their own product.

The perks were fittingly bestowed. The CIA did form an elite of the sort Thomas Jefferson feared in the Cincinnati. They were a king's secret army. Their leader had immediate access to the highest authority in the land, to the most secret budget and wildest research, to knowledge very embarrassing to one's country if the employees should turn out to be not entirely trustworthy.

They were required to think big and think wild, to freewheel and brainstorm, to deal with the shadiest sorts as well as the brainiest. Other intelligence agencies are larger and better funded; they multiply the same tasks indefinitely; but the CIA is supposed to do different things. In theory, there was nothing they could not do if doing it was thought necessary at the top. . . .

(2) *Colonizer.* Edward Lansdale, the legendary CIA man of the 1950s, tried to frighten Philippine communists by draining the blood from Huk bodies and putting marks on their throats to simulate vampire killings. Later, in Vietnam, he specialized in tricks like printing the ballot for Diem's opponents on green paper, since green was supposed to be a symbol of cuckoldry and cowardice. The dirty tricks more recently revealed—experimenting with LSD for use on enemies, or with potions to make Fidel Castro's beard fall out—have a long tradition in the secret police of colonizing forces. It shows a Ku Klux Klan mentality: we can spook the natives by dressing up like ghosts.

Like most colonizing forces, the CIA treated native lives as cheap. Speaking before the Senate intelligence committee, Thomas Keramessines, head of special operations, said he would resign from the CIA if he knew of any assassinations it carried out. He obviously didn't consider the large-scale terrorist assassinations in the CIA's Phoenix program to be assassinations. The Church committee deferred to this point of view when it issued the report on assassinations, whose whole emphasis was on plans to kill foreign leaders. Other kinds of ambush, terrorism, and "liquidation" do not seem to count. . . .

More important, the CIA's direction of various cultural operations reflects the importance of "in place" thinking among secret agencies. Spokesmen for clandestine intelligence often complain that military or political leaders, wanting information in a specific area, think a spy can be planted there and begin to produce results immediately. That is unlikely all the time, and impossible much of it. There is a far better chance to find and recruit some sympathizer already "in place" or—best of all—to have a person previously planted for some such eventuality. That was what the Agency was up to in the 1950s. The need for an orchestrated cultural offensive might not arise; but if it did, the Agency would have its own officers, their agents, and those beholden or compromised by collaborating, in the right places to direct such an assault. Liberals did not mind the generally anti-McCarthyite tenor of CIA-funded projects in the Fifties. The story would have been different if that cultural apparatus had been revealed at the peak of the Vietnam crisis or in the current time of investigations aimed at the Agency itself.

This is the real threat implied in the *Encounter* episode—it reveals a belief that the open processes of democracy are not sufficient for our government, that they need some "help" afforded them from behind the scenes. The actions in Chile and elsewhere show such a tendency in its blatant form. The *Encounter* affair reveals it in a subtler and more dangerous guise. The Agency was expressing its instinct that even the best informed people in the freest kind of constitutional government need manipulation by their invisible guardians. For Chile, "destabilizing" operations. For America, "stabil-

[1] Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1964.

izing" ones. The colonizing government, which has one kind of politics for its own citizens and another for colonial "natives," ends up having to impose some colony-discipline even on its own—if for no other reason, to hide the steps it feels it must take in "backward" parts of the empire. Thus England itself had to live under the Official Secrets Act if the Empire was to be governed by methods best left in the dark. The CIA, in order to accomplish an Iranian coup abroad, must impose a discipline of silence on all citizens at home—voluntary for its own members, unwitting for most of the populace.

The CIA's higher knowledge about the "real" struggle in the world gives it access to a higher code of morality. Richard Helms, testifying before the Church committee, expressed sympathy with the viewpoint of the CIA scientist who hid away shellfish toxin after President Nixon signed an international agreement to destroy all such weapons of biological warfare—the man, said Helms, was just acting "for the greater good." The higher code gives special license. The lawyer for the Cuban defendants in the "plumbers" trial said that his clients felt entitled to break the law since they had broken other laws in the past and been decorated for it by the CIA.

The higher code also imposes special duties. If there is any overriding imperative for the Agency, it is "Protect your agents." You might have to "protect" an agent by killing him; but in a world of endlessly mirrored mutual deceptions the minimal social glue is an agreement never to reveal an agent's ties with the CIA. The CIA usually has a double pledge for the secrecy of its operations. In the *Encounter* case, for example, it tried to keep its actions secret to maintain their effectiveness; but even if that motive had, for some reason, disappeared, it would still be bound to silence in order to protect Melvin Lasky, who was the agent in this instance.

Buckley's novel, of course, is a dramatization of the "higher law" ethic. The hero not only defies Congress at the novel's conclusion. The action he is hiding was undertaken, in the first place, to protect the Queen of England from her own indiscretions. (At the climax of the novel, the hero is almost assassinated by the Agency to protect his CIA identity.) The "real" governors of the world must prop up the governments that need propping, just as they tear down those that deserve "destabilizing." In a world view so shaped, it is laughable to expect "improved accountability" from the CIA. How can the superior organization be accountable to the inferior?

3) *Coriolanus.* The basic training for clandestine intelligence is in "tradecraft"—the rules to be observed for keeping one's role and task and identity secret. These rules are based on an assumption that one is being watched, suspected, betrayed. You must always presume the worst, to be on guard against any surprise. The result is a kind of shadow-awareness, always, of some Other watching you, of the Foe, of the invisible man on the other side of the chess board. It would be foolish to think that the enemy is any less intelligent than we are. Indeed, to protect its own officers, the Agency must instill in them a healthy respect for "the other side." This is needed, as well, to get funds and freedom of maneuver from one's own government—the more it fears an enemy, and suspects it of extensive and effective espionage, the more it will demand intelligence work on its own side. Furthermore, when defectors are found, they must be presented as important and serious figures (as when the CIA forged the Penkovsky memoirs for a prize defector).

So the Soviet spy is portrayed as a mistaken but dedicated adversary. Here is the way Allen Dulles puts it:

"He is blindly and unquestioningly dedicated to the cause, at least at the outset. He has been fully indoctrinated in the political and philosophical beliefs of Communism and in the basic motivation which proceeds from these beliefs, which is that the ends alone count and any means which achieve them are justified. Since the ingrained Soviet approach to the problems of life and politics is conspiratorial, it is no surprise that this approach finds its ultimate fulfillment in intelligence work. When such a man does finally see the light, as has happened, his disillusionment is overwhelming. The Soviet intelligence officer is throughout his career subject to a rigid discipline and, as one intelligence officer put it who had experienced this discipline himself, he "has graduated from an iron school." On the other hand, he belongs to an elite; he has privileges and power of a very special kind. [*Craft of Intelligence*, pp. 95–96]

Watching yourself through such an adversary's eyes, trying to think along with him to stay one step ahead of him, leads to a kind of intellectual marriage. *He* understands the stakes, just as you do. That is a bond that sets you apart from the duller and manipulated masses. Winning him over is the true victory. Arthur Koestler said, apocalyptically, that the final struggle for the world would be between communists and ex-communists. That was a view Whittaker Chambers expressed at times—and William Buckley brought Chambers onto the editorial staff of *National Review*, a magazine that seemed at first, principally made up of ex-communists and ex-CIA employees. The CIA would like to amend the Koestler formula slightly, making the final struggle occur between the CIA and the KGB.

In a sense the formula, however expressed, is tautological: the final struggle can only take place among those who know there is a final struggle. The rest of us, who do not live on that high plane of awareness and conflict, may suspect that thinking there is a "final" struggle is the only thing that can produce one—which just shows that we do not know the stakes. We are blind to the scale of our own danger, and must be protected, despite ourselves, by our clandestine benefactors. A spy can easily come to respect his highly conscious foe more than he does the sheep on his own side. This may explain the equivocal, oddly generous attitude of some British intelligence sorts to Kim Philby when he fled. Miles Copeland, the retired defender of the CIA, wrote in *Beyond Cloak and Dagger* (Pinnacle, 1975, p. 282): "To those deep inside the intelligence establishments, both East and West, it often seemed that the term 'the company' should apply to all of them considered together. Considering that the interplay between them is what determines the future of the world, they may have something."

The respect can also magnify the Enemy, turning him into an omnipresent threat, almost superhuman in his prescience and skill. Every move he makes must be presumed to be a feint. Even his setbacks may be staged ones to throw us off guard. For this reason James Burnham used to claim that the Sino-Soviet split was all a charade, played out for our deception. Even he gave up that analysis some time ago. It was no longer tenable anywhere but in the John Birch Society and in the CIA.

The bright university lads of the CIA do not agree with the real kooks of the John Birch Society, who find a communist under every bed. They pooh-pooh such talk, even though they sometimes encourage it for people who cannot get a more sophisticated grasp upon the communist danger. But the bright lads are also tough, not naive liberals. They reengage kookish specters at a higher level. After all, if there is not a communist under every bed, whose bed might better have a communist bug placed under it than a CIA agent's? Shouldn't one act as if one is there, just to be on the safe side? Thus does the higher Birchism creep in upon our saviors.

The CIA man is only important if his foe is. The stature of the enemy gives him his pride, as Aufidius and Coriolanus must boast of the other man's prowess to establish their own. They are totally oriented toward each other. Each is the other's Destiny.

Thou hast beat me out
Twelve several times, and I have nightly since
Dreamt of encounters 'twixt thyself and me;
We have been down together in my sleep,
Unbuckling helms, fisting each other's throat,
And waked half dead with nothing.

If communism were to disappear overnight from the face of the earth, some totally devoted anticommunists would find their lives not fulfilled but disintegrating. Life would be robbed of the normative thing that gave it meaning. Coriolanus want to beat Aufidius, yet still to have Aufidius around to fight. . . .

William Buckley has said that Stimson's famous 1929 remarks about gentlemen not opening other people's mail was well enough in some other kind of world, but the menace of communism makes it necessary for us first to make the world safe for gentlemen. It is easy to predict that the world will never be thus safe: if virtue had to wait until vice disappeared before venturing to exist, the world would see no virtue. But it is true that the KGB and the CIA give each other their reason for being. They live for each other. The rest of us are not supposed to interrupt this clash of higher powers over our heads. They were born for this.

DEVELOPING APPROPRIATE TECHNOLOGIES

HON. JEROME A. AMBRO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. AMBRO. Mr. Speaker, there is a developing area of thought in the world of science policy that merits the close attention of all who argue for sound investment of U.S. research and development funds. Called appropriate technology, it promises to alleviate the problems inadvertently created when scientific advances lost sight of their central purpose: to enhance the general environment of the society it serves. A recent review of E. F. Schumacher's "Small Is Beautiful" published in Technology Review stated:

We must develop a lifestyle, he says, compatible with the real needs of people. Technology has its uses, and was probably very helpful during the 19th century in the production of more goods with less labor. Now it produces too many unwanted hands. People are losing their human drive and becoming biological misfits. Meanwhile cheap energy is running out; nuclear power plants are alarmingly dangerous, the environment is progressively devastated. High technology, now dominant in both agriculture and industry, is on an anti-survival track. Yes, we need technology, but on a more intelligent plane—"technology with a face." [1]

Every society develops a technology appropriate to it. The problem we now seem to be facing is not so much a problem of technology as it is a reflection of

[1] Stuart Chase, "Technology With a Human Face," *Technology Review* (October/November, 1975); page 68.

the changing society we live in. But technology is a flexible servant, restrained only by the organizations that manage them. Unfortunately, those organizations often lack the kind of flexibility seen in the technologies they manage:

The implications of the way we choose to do things are far wider and more significant than the criteria of the dollar cost of the immediate actions. Smaller scales and regional autonomy in the ways we produce our goods, make available our services, and control our social processes is possible. Such technology is necessary to our political and economic health. . . .[2]

In discussing this, I find it wholly applicable to the problems of implementing energy conservation methods and the alternative energy plans that are being proposed. These are, in fact, regionally tailored processes difficult to manage from a central bureaucracy. This difficulty in no way diminishes their importance. The opposite is true. We must organize our political and scientific communities to be responsive to these new demands our society is making on our technological base. These demands are the logical outcome of an educated society that has close contact with the products of our research and development efforts. Understanding has brought a desire to fully realize the potential technology offers. We must work to make sure Federal policies meet this new demand.

[2] Tom Bender, "Sharing Smaller Pies," monograph.

GAO QUESTIONS PAY COMPARABILITY FOR FEDERAL "BLUE-COLLAR" WORKERS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1972, Public Law 92-392 was enacted to provide for a fair and equitable procedure for setting and annually adjusting the pay of wage board or "blue-collar" employees in the Federal Government.

These employees include skilled and unskilled laborers, craftsmen, and tradesmen.

Under this law, it is intended that the rates of pay for Federal "blue-collar" employees shall be consistent with the rates of pay of their counterparts in the private sector within a local labor market area.

Public Law 92-392 provides that pay rates be based on the principles that:

There will be equal pay for substantially equal work within the same local wage area;

There will be relative differences in pay within a local wage area when there are substantial or recognizable differences in duties, responsibilities, and qualification requirements among positions;

The levels of pay will be maintained in line with prevailing levels for comparable work within a local wage area; and

The levels of pay will be maintained to attract and retain qualified employees;

On an annual basis, the Federal agency with the largest number of employees in the 137 appropriated fund and 147 nonappropriated fund wage areas established by the Civil Service Commission throughout the Nation conducts a wage survey to determine the proper rates of pay.

As a result of these surveys, true comparability is supposedly attained for these employees.

However, according to a recent General Accounting Office report entitled "Improving the Pay Determination Process for Federal Blue-Collar Employees," this is not so.

The GAO report points out that because of certain provisions of Public Law 92-392, Federal blue-collar wage rates often exceed local prevailing rates, putting the Government at a competitive advantage in the labor market. This situation arises because of the following legislative provisions:

The Federal pay range at each non-supervisory grade is 16 percent with five equal steps. In contrast, most private sector employees are paid under single-rate pay schedules. When multiple-step schedules exist in the private sector, many have fewer steps than the Federal system. The second Federal step is equated to the prevailing private sector rate, but most Federal employees moved to the fifth step in May 1975—placing them 12 percent above market.

Under certain conditions private sector wage rates used in setting Federal rates may be based on private rates of other localities. (The so-called Monroney Amendment.)

Federal night differentials are based on percentage of employees' scheduled wage rates. This often results in a more generous differential than the prevailing private sector differential.

To insure that the legislative pay principle of comparability is attained, the Congress may wish to reconsider these legislative provisions.

More representative survey coverage needed:

Annual surveys are made of private industry wages in 137 geographic areas. State and local governments are excluded by law and certain segments of the private sector by administrative action.

To insure that wage date is sufficiently representative of local prevailing wages, the Congress may wish to consider allowing State and local governments to be included in the survey process. Also, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission should:

Expand wage surveys to cover the broadest feasible universe of private sector establishments;

Reassess periodically and adjust as necessary wage and survey area boundaries;

Require appropriate agencies in areas having a specialized Government industry to determine whether sufficient applicable industry exists in the entire wage area before going outside of the area for wage data;

Require that the predominant Federal jobs in each wage area which have comparable private industry jobs be surveyed in addition to the required jobs.

Improving data collection process:

Teams of Federal employees, selected from the local area, match private sector jobs with descriptions of Federal jobs and collect private sector wage rates for the jobs. It is likely that many errors have been introduced into the wage data because of fundamental weaknesses in collection techniques.

To improve these, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission should:

Establish a permanent body of carefully selected and thoroughly trained full-time collectors to minimize errors.

Establish additional quality controls of the data collection process.

Mr. Speaker, recently, the General Accounting Office testified on this report before the Subcommittee on Employee Rights and Intergovernmental Programs of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. In a colloquy with H. L. Kreiger, Director of Federal Personnel and Compensation Division, I stressed the importance, in fact the necessity of having a competent wage survey team review a representative number of firms in the private sector to insure that the data collected is a valid basis for setting and adjusting wage rates.

Mr. Speaker, this seems to be the keystone in carrying out the policy outlined in Public Law 92-392.

Some of the aforementioned recommendations of the General Accounting Office to improve the process of achieving comparability for Federal blue-collar workers are already being implemented administratively by the Civil Service Commission. Others will require legislation.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, President Ford, in his budget for fiscal year 1977, proposed to reform certain aspects of the law governing Wage Board pay rates in accordance with the recommendations of the President's "Panel on Federal Compensation." These recommendations were similar to those contained in the GAO report.

The proposed reforms listed in the budget report are: first, repeal of the Monroney amendment; second, amend the night shift differential provision; third, provide step rate increases which are more consistent with national private industry practice; fourth, adjust wage schedules to compare with the coverage of private industry and Wage Board salaries; and fifth, including State and local government salaries in wage surveys.

It is estimated that if these recommendations are enacted into law, a substantial savings will accrue to the Federal Government annually.

The Civil Service Commission informs me that appropriate legislation implementing these proposed reforms will be submitted to the Congress within the next few weeks.

Mr. Speaker, if the Government intends to adhere to the concept of comparability for its blue-collar employees, then immediate attention must be given to the recommendations of the General Accounting Office.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF BUENA VISTA COLLEGE PRESIDENT

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, last fall, Mr. Keith G. Briscoe was inaugurated as the 16th president of Buena Vista College in Storm Lake, Iowa. In his acceptance address, Mr. Briscoe spoke of the problems which face our Nation while reminding us of our ability to find their

solution. And, most importantly, he emphasized that, in our young people, we have an invaluable resource with which to meet the challenges of the future.

As we in Congress grapple with the many complex issues of the 1970's, I think that we would do well to reflect for a moment on Mr. Briscoe's message. I thus hereby submit this distinguished educator's inaugural address for inclusion in the RECORD, and commend his remarks to my colleagues:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

President Keith G. Briscoe delivered the following address on the occasion of his Inauguration as sixteenth President of Buena Vista College on Saturday, October 18, 1975.

Mr. Chairman, Trustees, Honored Guests, Members of the College community, special guests representing great colleges of the State and Nation, our students, my friends, my family:

I am honored to stand here—at this time, in this place—as part of Buena Vista College. But the honor you have bestowed upon me is one that I must share with those who have molded the foundation upon which I seek to build.

I feel that this day should focus also on my wife Carmen, who assumes with me responsibilities for the future and without whose love and dedication I would not be here today. Because of her and of the love and trust of my family, I look to the future with confidence.

Then, too, on this day I have memories of great teachers: the Raulps, Warrens, Debowers, Clarks, and Siewerts. A people blessed with such great teachers has much to be proud of. I remember them . . . I stand in their debt. Their legacy was helping to build leaders for this nation. Our legacy, as mentors, scholars, and businessmen, will be not only how we teach others, but also how we answer and respond to the critical issues of our time.

The American dream, said Archibald MacLeish, "was promises". And the promises of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness inspired the dreams of Americans for generations. How do we prepare our potential leaders to cope with true independence? It is the preparation of young people for America's future that I wish to speak today.

How does one expand dreams into visions, and visions into realities? History gives us a clue. We have not forgotten that the founders of this nation were men of vision who conceived a form of government unique to civilization. Nor have we forgotten that, even before the constitution, they also conceived the American private college—an institution designed to prepare men and women to broaden their horizons and to pursue their dreams through the study of the liberal arts. Just as men of breadth and vision built our constitution, so will citizens of breadth and vision solve the critical problems of our own time.

Today we have need for new dreams. Our vistas are narrower; our last frontier has a new pipeline; our virgin land is gone. America is no longer a developing nation. In marked contrast to the third world, we are a developed nation—one which has exchanged its growing pains for internal discomforts.

Our churches are being divided again as they were in Luther's time . . . yet we see no Calvin or Wesley on the horizon. Our major political parties spend millions campaigning against each other . . . yet they are so similar philosophically that each has its right and left segments. Scientists strive to conquer space . . . yet they fail to solve the challenges of human suffering or to conquer cancer, heart disease, pollution-related health disorders, birth defects, and emphysema. Social concerns exist within every type of organization . . . yet many leaders become self-serving and lose interest when the issues no longer yield high lecture fees or no longer gather votes.

Government regulations are established without research or concern for their environmental impact; rather, many are established to gain support from special interest groups. And once passed, they remain on the books forever, causing millions to condemn laws of the land which limit their own personal dreams. The world monetary system has been adjusted to the point that the original concept is lost. A new economic order must be found not only for America—but for the world. And it must be built upon the powerful sense of mission to other people that we Americans possess.

We have great resources, great wealth, great strength. Our nation has the vital material ingredients with which to establish this new order. But it will be those Americans who are broadly trained in economics, sociology, science, commerce, political science history, religion, languages, and the arts who will conceive this new order. These graduates, understanding the interrelationships of these courses, will take to the world the American dream, demonstrate the economic dimension of our multi-cultural civilization, harness the human and raw energy of the world, and bring us to realize that we are a nation among nations of equal interdependence.

Walt Whitman characterized us as "a teeming nation of nations," he saw us as a nation of diverse nationalities, races, religions. Other nations have, throughout history, built upon or are yet building upon a single people, a single nationality, a single race, or a single religion. No other nation has ever accepted the challenge of becoming a melting pot for all tongues, cultures, religions, and ideals as has America.

It was not the sword that changed the cultures of the world . . . rather it was ideas. Conquest always failed to make men from many cultures brothers . . . it took the fulfillment of the American dream to do that.

Disparate peoples embraced America, accepting her as their own without coercion. They came with courage, not fear. They came with hope, not despair. They came prepared to face hardships, and they created a new nation of nations. They came knowing that what made them different made them Americans. And the cultures they represented and that their descendants represent are still alive for those who study the liberal arts.

Can America's story become a world-wide story? Or will we go as other great nations have gone before us? Our civilization, built upon the great wealth of our land, has given us the world's most productive system of agriculture and industry. But history warns us that earlier civilizations had most the same opportunities—but lost after the rape of the land had badly depleted the natural resources. New priorities toward our future use of resources will not come from those trained only in one segment of agriculture, or of technology, or of industry; instead they will come from those who understand that each solution to a problem has psychological, biological, sociological, and economic consequences—and that each solution creates a new problem.

Only those with solid, broad foundations of knowledge can plot a course for a nation with a shrinking frontier; sprawling, decaying cities, and polluted, abused land. Only they can lead us to grasp that with private ownership go personal responsibilities. Only they can convince us that, in America, to take away economic freedom is to weaken the work ethic.

America is a productive place because it is a work place. Working in America is our greatest strength—it is our ethic. Americans have always believed that hard work made their dreams come true. But there is developing a new work ethic. On the positive side, we no longer accept slavery or exploitation; on the negative side, we have many Americans who are employed below their capacities . . . if at all.

Our problem now is to create a climate for life that is both productive and leisure-centered. The problem will not be solved by unions demanding greater remuneration without correspondingly greater productivity; nor by a welfare state that finds third generations enrolled—generations whose lives are meaningless because they have never learned to enjoy the fruits of labor; nor by people unprepared to enjoy leisure hours away from work and in retirement. Nor will it be the technocrat, the labor leader, or the bureaucrat who solves these problems, for they are reactors . . . seldom producers.

No, he who finds the new American work ethic will be someone trained in the meaning of life, the profit of work, and the pleasures of the arts—someone from our liberal arts colleges.

Just as America is a work place, it is also a market place, unexcelled in bringing technology and marketing together. Entrepreneurs have transformed the energies and natural resources of this nation into the greatest wonder of the economic world, and today in this audience are some of the great ones.

The term "profit" was viewed with excitement for 200 years; so also was "free enterprise". Today both are under suspicion. Yet profit and free enterprise have brought us to the highest level of civilization ever achieved. Our nation is, in fact, so strong as to permit the heavy taxing of corporations in an attempt to solve all of today's problems today, rather than following the wiser course of permitting a better depreciation allowance for recapitalization (not to mention double taxation), thereby guaranteeing our future.

Private education, like business, cannot operate at a deficit—nor can we levy taxes to cover inefficiency. The public cost, per student, in private education is the least expensive in America; yet the private sector of higher education proudly maintains its reputation for excellence. And it is the profit of the businessman, the farmer, the corporation that continues to ensure our quality and our survival, because they, too, believe that the nation needs and will continue to need those with liberal educations.

Private colleges are the leaders of the free enterprise system in education. If our nation is to continue to grow, it will be those trained in business at liberal arts colleges who will help to stimulate it. The effect of a Christian college asking social questions, operating as a business based on Christian ethics, and serving as a model for aspiring young businessmen will both strengthen and enhance the image of free enterprise in America.

Today we have discussed America as it has grown up and has established its place in the world as a land of plenty . . . not only as a nation of nations, but as a nation of farmers, workers, and businessmen—as a people still striving as did their forefathers to create a more perfect union. We are a dream . . . a work ethic . . . a religious nation . . . an economic marvel. We are a collection of rugged individuals—a democracy with equal voices in the affairs of man which can return great dividends when used. Collectively, government can take away our incentive to work . . . our freedom of worship . . . our desire to dream and explore . . . our characteristic individualism. Collectively, broadly educated voters have the tools to measure the effectiveness of those who represent them and to approve or disapprove any or all of their actions.

It might appear that I am biased toward a liberal arts education for all. That is not totally correct, for we need well-trained persons from our fine technical institutions for

immediate work placement. And we need the research and services of our great universities. We as a nation cannot survive without the distinctive contributions of all three.

My major point today is that a significant part of this nation must be liberally educated if we are to identify with accuracy our divergent needs and problems, to chart a future course for America, and to establish its priorities for continued greatness . . . for the liberal arts graduate is the very mortar of the foundation of this nation.

It is my firm belief that the creative, capable leaders we seek will have been educated in the liberal arts tradition, for it is the private liberal arts college that develops a sense of family . . . it does more than create belongers—it unites. It is the private liberal arts college that educates for work and life . . . it creates more than wishers—it creates productive workers who enjoy living. It is the private liberal arts college that believes "In God We Trust" . . . it creates thinkers—but it also creates believers.

Mr. Chairman, it is with honor that I accept the presidency of Buena Vista College, a liberal arts college that has a mission in America. To you, the trustees and faculty of this college, I accept your charge, understanding fully that this is more than just a day to inaugurate the sixteenth president. Rather, it is a day that we all . . . trustees, alumni, friends, faculty, students, administration and staff . . . must rededicate our belief in Buena Vista College, striving ever to achieve our fullest potential in institutional support and in developing our collective and individual talents in order to better fulfill our mission. For in John's gospel, Jesus said, "We must work the works of Him who sent me, while it is day; night comes, when no one can work."

The old know only too well how brief is the day of a person's working life; the young who stand on the threshold of their productive years hold a rich treasure. We must renew our dedication to nurturing this treasure, so that their dreams—their visions of their future and America's—can become realities.

For it is in the Lord's name this college was created . . . it is in the Lord's name it continues to exist. I ask that from this day on you join me in demonstrating this renewal.

MAYOR DORA GAINES OF ECORSE, MICH., JOINS THE RANKS OF MORE THAN 500 BLACK WOMEN ELECTED OFFICIALS

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the struggle for equality for all citizens has been long and difficult. During the 1950's and early 1960's significant advances in the area of civil rights were made. In the past few years the momentum has shifted from political equality to sexual equality.

Today more than 500 black women hold public office, four times the number in 1969. Among those who have recently become public officials is Mrs. Dora Gaines of Ecorse, Mich., a city of 17,500 people. Active in politics since the age of 18, educated at Wayne State University, Dora Gaines has served on the city council since 1972 and was appointed mayor of Ecorse in November 1975. Mayor Gaines is more than equal to the challenge of being the mother of nine children, keeping active in the First Baptist Church and in her many other community involvements, and being mayor.

Two articles in the Michigan Chronicle on January 10 and the Detroit Free Press on January 2 highlight the growing importance of black women in politics. I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the admirable work of Mayor Gaines and of several other women in State politics. I believe they are the wave of the future:

[From the Michigan Chronicle, Jan. 10, 1976]

CAPTURES TWO FIRSTS WITH APPOINTMENT—ECORSE'S NEW "HIZZONER" IS A LADY

(By Darcelle Kanoyton)

History was made in Ecorse recently as, for the first time, a Black woman is serving as mayor. The city has never had either a Black or a woman serve in that post.

The new mayor is Mrs. Dora Gaines, who has been active in politics since she was 18, but says she had always been content to be the woman behind the candidate.

It was not until after she was appointed to the City Council in 1972 that she realized she wanted to run for office. Mayor Gaines served as a precinct delegate in Ecorse in 1968. She was appointed to the Council in 1972 and was later elected to the Council. She then served as mayor pro tem from November, 1975, until just a few weeks ago when she was appointed mayor upon the death of former Mayor Charles Coman.

Some of the goals Mayor Gaines has in mind include development of a senior citizen high-rise, increased recreation facilities, increased business for the area and more adequate transportation.

The new mayor is a lifetime resident of Ecorse. She attended school there and also attended Wayne State university.

Commenting on the challenges she faces in her new position, Mayor Gaines stated that one of the greatest challenges will be "to let my fellow men in this community know and feel that I am no different from any other official and that they can come to me with their problems."

She added, "I want them to know that I am not just a Black mayor but mayor of the entire city."

Mayor Gaines states that she does not call herself a women's libber. However, she commented, "I am a firm believer that women can do some jobs equally as well as men and some others even better."

Commenting on the general attitude in the Ecorse community, she stated, "I think some men feel that no women qualify to sit in top positions or to sit alongside them."

She added, "My greatest achievement will be to prove to this community and other communities that we can achieve our goals under the direction of a woman as mayor."

Mayor Gaines stated that her only goal in politics is to give service and she plans to remain strictly on the city level in politics. Her current term runs until November, 1977.

Although her family is understandably proud of her appointment, they have reacted quietly. She explained, "We are not a family that thrives on prestige. We have long since passed that because I was either the first woman or the first Black in every position I've had in the city."

Mayor Gaines and her husband, John, have nine children ranging in age from 13 to 26. She is a member of First Baptist church and many community organizations.

The overall community reaction to her appointment has been very gracious, according to Mayor Gaines. She stated that she does expect to be faced with certain obstacles but added, "I will meet them and overcome them with an open mind."

[From the Detroit Free Press, Jan. 2, 1976]

BLACK WOMEN MAYORS—ONE OF THEM SAYS "NOT BAD FOR A LITTLE OLD LADY"

(By Charlote Robinson)

In 1971, Ellen Walker Craig, 69, a black woman, defeated her younger male opponent by nine votes to become the mayor of Urbancrest, Ohio.

Urbancrest has an all-black population of 729, and her election was hardly a significant political coup, but still Mrs. Craig is proud. She was the first black woman elected mayor in the United States.

"Not bad for a little old lady," she recalled recently.

Out of more than a half-million elective offices in the United States, there are 530 black women elected officials.

"Black women are just starting to go into politics, and it's about time," said Mrs. Craig. "It took two social movements to get black women out front—the civil rights movement and the feminist movement."

The combination of the two movements has had its effect in the '70s. According to statistics from the Joint Center for Political Studies in Washington, D.C., in 1969 there were only 131 black women elected officials in the United States.

The 530 black women elected as of November, 1975 include four U.S. representatives—Barbara Jordan, Shirley Chisholm, Yvonne Brathwaite Burke and Cardiss Collins; 35 state government officials; 31 in county government posts; 203 in municipal government; 34 in law enforcement (judges, etc.) and 214 in education (college and school boards).

Now there are 10 black women mayors, including Dora Gaines who was recently appointed by the Ecorse City Council to serve out the two-year term of Mayor Charles Coman who died Nov. 29.

Dora Gaines, the new mayor of Ecorse, points out she had no choice in whether she would be a man or woman, black or white . . . "but I did have a choice of whether I wanted to do something to help make this city a better place to live in."

With the exception of Mrs. Gaines, who heads a city with a population of 17,515, and Doris Davis, mayor of Compton, Calif., population 69,000, the women are running small, predominantly black towns with populations of less than 7,000. The towns include Richwood, La.; Fairplay, Colo.; Rendville, Ohio; Easton, Texas; Mansfield, La., and South Bay, Fla.

One woman, Eunice Matthews of Highland Beach, Md., runs a town of six people. It's 200 people in the summer but during the winter the whole town occupies Mrs. Matthews' household: she, her husband and four children.

Mrs. Verdiacee Goston, 48, runs the town of Richwood, La., a newly incorporated town with a population of 2,500, three miles south of Monroe.

At the third National Institute of Black Elected Officials, held recently in Washington D.C., Mrs. Goston talked about her town and her office.

Early in 1974, Mrs. Goston petitioned the governor of Louisiana to incorporate Richwood as a township. The town was created Dec. 31, 1974. "I thought if we became a town we could participate in revenue sharing," she said. "None of the federal dollar had ever trickled down to us in our community."

The average income in Richwood is under $3,000 a year. There are two people who make over $8,000—one a farmer, the other a teacher. About 15 percent of the population is on welfare, and many are receiving some form of Social Security. "It's a community of small farmers—backyard gardens, mainly—women who do general housework in the city of Monroe and laborers," she said.

As mayor, Mrs. Goston takes no salary. Her husband, John, is the town's chief of

police and he gets $250 a month. He was appointed by the governor at the same time she was appointed mayor.

"It happened by accident," she recalled. "John had driven me to Baton Rouge to be sworn in as mayor, and the governor told us we had to have a chief of police right away. John was the only one handy."

The town's community center—an old dance hall that the townspeople remodeled—houses the town hall. "While the government is in session, children may be roller-skating in the main hall. The community center houses just about everything," she said.

"The state put in a meals-on-wheels program to feed 18 elderly people at the community center. We already had a volunteer program at the center to feed all the elderly people in the town," she said.

Mrs. Goston's first year in office has not been without waves. "I get a lot of criticism from the two people who are making more than $8,000," she said, smiling. And one newspaper recently called her an "ignorant little old lady."

"Now I didn't mind being called ignorant. I'm self-educated: I never went to school for very long when I was growing up. I don't mind being called old—I'm a grandmother.

"But," she said, indicating her ample figure, "I ain't little."

Mrs. Goston has big plans for little Richwood. "We're going to grow," she said. "We have got a lot of land out here that can be developed. Some industry could come out here. We'd like to get our own school." (Now the town's children go to school in Monroe).

And Mrs. Goston plans to institute a town garbage collection service—right now the citizens have private collection paid individually.

"It's not going to be no big I's and little you's in Richwood," she said. "We're going to grow together."

Mrs. Craig, mayor of Urbancrest, has always been involved in the government of her town.

If she wasn't on the city council herself, her husband or her uncle or her brother was. She's lived in the town all of her life, and most of its residents are relatives or close friends.

"That's one of the reasons I don't like to hold Mayor's Court (like a traffic court). It would create all kinds of problems with family and friends," she said.

Mrs. Craig, a former domestic and her husband, a former maintenance man, are both retired and live on Social Security. The mayor's salary is $500 a year. "This is my last year as mayor," she said. "I'm not going to run again. I owe it to my husband to stay home and be with him now. He's been my biggest fan and my biggest encouragement."

During her term, she said, the town has bought and renovated an office building to house the government, and a youth council has been established to give the town's young people a say in the running of the government. "I haven't done too bad," she said. "I just got out there and did my thing."

Dora Gaines, the new mayor of Ecorse, as the top vote-getter on the city's council, was mayor pro tem until her appointment.

Mrs. Gaines is a lifelong resident of Ecorse. She said she has been in politics since she was 18 years old. "I worked for candidates in virtually every kind of election," she said. She first took office as a councilwoman in 1972 when she was appointed by then Mayor Albert Zukonik after a recall of three councilmen. She was reelected in 1973.

Her husband, John, is a painter for the city and also operates a painting business of his own. He was once nominated to be appointed the city's DPW superintendent, at $20,000 a year, but he turned it down.

In her address to the City Council after her appointment, Mrs. Gaines noted that having a black woman mayor "must bring some fear and apprehension to many of our citizens."

But, she said, "I am exactly what you are, a fellow citizen of this city. And I'm here tonight for the same reasons you are—because I want to live in a better community."

Mrs. Gaines pointed out that she had no choice in whether she would be a man or a woman, black or white.

"But I did have a choice of whether I wanted to do something to help make this city a better place to live in," she said.

REVIEWING OUR FOREIGN POLICY—II

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I inserted in the RECORD the first half of an article by Richard Barnet appropriately titled "The Great Foreign Policy Debate We Ought To Be Having." Our experience in Vietnam, according to Mr. Barnet, indicates a need for a sweeping reassessment of our foreign policy, not only in tactical detail, but in terms of our most fundamental goals and assumptions.

Today I am inserting the remainder of Mr. Barnet's article as it appeared in the January 17 issue of the New Republic. It is my hope that the Congress will heed his suggestion and conduct a thorough review of the U.S. role in the world, perhaps through a select committee created expressly for that purpose.

Mr. Barnet's observations continue as follows:

THE GREAT FOREIGN POLICY DEBATE WE OUGHT TO BE HAVING—II

(By Richard J. Barnet)

Much of our official anti-communism has not involved the Soviet Union directly. Well over half of the military budget is for what used to be called conventional forces (ships, planes, tanks and ground combat units) and these, along with the CIA covert action operations, have been used to bring about or prevent internal political changes in other countries, mostly in Asia, Africa and Latin America. A partial list of countries in which a U.S. military intervention or a U.S.-backed coup has been attempted since the end of World War II includes the Congo, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Iran, Laos, Lebanon, the Sudan, Syria and Vietnam.

The U.S. has found itself fighting nationalist movements around the world in the name of anti-communism for three basic reasons. (Since we are likely to encounter similar nationalist movements closer to home in the next few years—Panama and Puerto Rico, for example—it is especially urgent to examine them.) We are implementing our global counterrevolutionary policy by maintaining forces not needed for the defense of the U.S. at a cost of about $36 billion a year. What are we buying? Why are we buying it?

The first argument for fighting a nationalist, revolutionary movement led by Communists as in Vietnam, has been containment of Soviet power. From the early days of the cold war to the Johnson administration the official US belief was that insurgent movements were secret weapons of the Kremlin. Mao was Stalin's agent. Ho was a puppet on a long string from Moscow. It was legitimate and necessary to intervene internally in the affairs of other countries to forestall Russian conquest by Trojan Horse. The historical evidence suggests otherwise. Nationalist movements, whether inspired by Marxist-Leninism or not, are fiercely independent. When they succeed they do not automatically increase the power of the Soviet state. (Indeed the relations between the Kremlin and Communist regimes that have come to power independent of the Red Army—China, Albania, Cuba, Vietnam—have often been stormy.) Soviet arms shipments to North Vietnam followed massive US military intervention. It was the US that set the pace of the competitive intervention. So also in Cuba. Both the Cubans and the Vietnamese have made it clear that they would like normal, even friendly relations with the US to lessen their dependence upon the USSR. If the motive behind the counterrevolutionary policy is containment of the Soviet Union, we should consider whether a policy of competitive non-intervention would serve our purposes better. We now know that the more engaged the US has become in aiding governments threatened with insurgency, the more Russia and China have aided the revolutionaries and the more weak independence movements have fallen under their sway.

But there is a second argument for using American power to influence internal political and economic changes in other countries. There is a missionary spirit behind American imperialism. With technical aid and foreign investment we can rescue the poor countries of the Third World from the irrationalities of socialism. We can transplant the American model of development and in the process create a congenial world for the flourishing of the American economy. But there is now abundant evidence that the American model is a failure for most poor countries, that without basic structural reform for the redistribution of wealth a veneer of capitalism in feudal societies perpetuates and exacerbates poverty.

True Communist approaches to development have at times been dogmatic, impractical and punitive. But if we take as the criterion of success the welfare of the majority of people—literacy, nutrition, health care, jobs—the Communist revolutions that we oppose—China, Cuba, North Vietnam—seem to do far better than the "Free World" governments we support. There should be a candid discussion about why the United States so often appears to be on "the wrong side" in revolutionary struggles. Indeed why is it in the interest of the United States to be on any side? If we do not have the answers for poor countries, why should we not encourage a variety of experiments? (The Chilean case is instructive. By helping to overthrow the Allende experiment we helped to bring into power a government that is not only repressive but incompetent. Because of disastrous economic policies the position of the Chilean middle class for whose benefit the coup was supposedly carried out is much worse than it was under Allende.)

The third argument behind global anti-communism is the threat of totalitarianism. Communist regimes do not offer freedom of the press or other democratic liberties traditional to the United States. Political repression and executions have taken place under left-oriented nationalist regimes. But the argument that the US is fighting communism in the name of freedom is wearing thin since the level of repression in such leading members of the Free World as Brazil, Iran and Indonesia is high. By ignoring repression in the countries it supports most closely, the United States has undermined whatever moral influence it might have over other countries. It is difficult after welcomng the Salazar dictatorship as an ally for over 20 years to emerge as a convincing defender of Portuguese democracy. The issue of totalitar-

ianism is central. But the debate should focus on the extent to which the US in its present policies, particularly military aid and arms sales, is promoting and legitimizing dictatorship and the extent to which the spread of dictatorship around the world ultimately threatens the survival of democracy in America.

In short we need a debate about how the U.S. should relate to the process of political and economic developments taking place around the world. President Ford and Secretary Kissinger repeatedly warn of a wave of "neo-isolationism" that will engulf Americans and cause them to shirk their "responsibilities." These expletives are the current official favorites. Every imperial power has asserted its responsibilities for other people and has killed a good number of them in the process. "Isolationism" had a real meaning in 1940. It was a convenient label to apply to the significant number of Americans who didn't, for a variety of reasons, want to fight Hitler. It is now used in political discourse like a Pavlovian bell. Everyone wants to fight Hitler. But the contemporary meaning of the word is hopelessly confused. (Adding a "neo" merely makes matters murkier.)

The links of interdependence between the American economy and the world economy are so pervasive that isolationism is not a possibility for the United States. The choice is not whether the United States is to be integrally involved in the international system but the terms of the involvement. This is the crux of the debate we are not having. The self-perpetuating elite that has run our foreign policy for a generation have assumed that the United States cannot afford to share its power by accepting limits on its right to make crucial unilateral decisions—whether to use nuclear weapons, whether to invade other countries, whether to change the ground rules of the international monetary system. The strategy has been to perpetuate for as long as possible the preeminent military and economic position the United States enjoyed at the end of World War II. As the ruined economies of West Europe and Japan recovered and the Soviet Union became a formidable military rival, the tactics for achieving continued American preeminence have been modified. The issues concerning the management of the world economy and distribution of resources are crowding out the older issues of the cold war, many of which like Germany, Vietnam and Cuba have more or less been settled. But the resistance to sharing power remains. The hostile reaction of the Ford administration to the efforts of the poor countries to create a more equitable "new international economic order" reflects a deep-seated isolationism. We are in the unenviable position of defending privilege against the majority of people in an increasingly desperate world.

There is nothing exceptional about such a posture. Every great nation tries to hold on to what it has. But empires collapse because they lose touch with their own time and employ self-defeating strategies for maintaining their power. The issue is whether the security of Americans will be better served by trying to perpetuate the era of American hegemony after the conditions for it have passed or by taking the lead in building a more equitable international economic order and a less militarized international political order. Candor, now in vogue as a political virtue, requires a painful assessment of the real conflicts between American comfort and the survival of a majority of mankind.

One of the most deceptive words in the foreign policy lexicon is "we." Discussion of the American national interest assumes that all Americans share the same interests, that what is a good US policy for Anaconda in Chile or for Gulf Oil in Italy is necessarily a good policy for American wage earners and consumers. It has become clearer in recent months that CIA covert operations have to a significant degree been for the direct support of US-based multinational corporations. That is one example—the Soviet wheat deal is another—of a foreign policy intitiative from which the benefits flow to a small group of Americans and the costs are borne by a much larger segment of society. It is by no means clear that unemployed workers in Detroit, supermarket shoppers and small businessmen have the same foreign policy interests as the largest banks and corporations. Yet it is the representatives of these institutions who continue to make policy in the name of all Americans. There can be no serious consideration of alternative goals and policies without enlarging the circle of policy makers to include representatives of many domestic interests which are vitally affected by foreign policy decisions but which now have no voice in deciding what "we" do as a nation. Until foreign policy is seen for what it is—a reflection of present domestic policy and a context for evolving domestic policy—discussions will never rise above emotionalism and abstraction. A redefinition of America's role in the world will come, if it does, only as part of a process of redefining American society.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM ACT

HON. VIRGINIA SMITH

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 1976

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, many emotional misconceptions and incorrect impressions have been generated over those provisions of the proposed Criminal Justice Reform Act dealing with the use of force to repel a night intruder or prowler. I would like to take this opportunity to comment on some of these inaccuracies.

The prime concern has been that an armed burglar could invade a private home with evil intent, and the homeowner would have to withdraw and subject his family to grave danger because his natural reaction to protect would be unlawful. This concept is misleading for several reasons: First, and most important, the Criminal Justice Reform Act would only apply to areas of exclusive Federal jurisdiction. Second, the bill upholds the right to reasonably protect oneself or family from a risk of serious bodily harm. And third, the provisions now in the bill are simply a codification of law that has always been operative.

This codification effort would not have any impact at all on the ordinary American home because it would apply only to areas under exclusive Federal control, such as ships at sea, military bases, Federal Government buildings, or other Federal enclaves. Each State maintains its traditional responsibility to enact and enforce criminal sanctions. These are the statutes which will continue to govern any incident not within Federal jurisdiction.

Contrary to the impression held by many, the bill would permit the use of a weapon to protect against an invading criminal except when it would be obvious to a reasonable person, even under the stress of the situation, that there would be no danger to himself or others in his home. For instance, there would be little excuse for shooting a trespasser clearly recognized as an unpopular neighbor who mistakenly stumbled into the wrong home. Another classic example of the situation this provision is meant to prevent is the placement of a spring gun to automatically injure whoever enters a vacant home. This is clearly not justified because the person wounded may be a good neighbor trying to set the mail inside, or even a relative arriving on a surprise visit. But again let me emphasize, these provisions would only apply to Federal enclaves.

Finally, this bill merely carries forward what has always been the law. In the case of a homeowner trying to repulse a night invader, he would be justified in using deadly force to avoid a threat of bodily harm—a threat generally inherent in the typical instance of night crime. The homeowner would then be judged only on the basis of the threat he reasonably perceived, whether or not the threat was actual.

It is my feeling, however, that we need to take a lesson from the misunderstandings I have tried to outline. Whenever Congress undertakes legislation with the scope, complexity, and detail of this bill, it is my hope that consideration would be thorough and open to assure the American public that in the effort to enact worthy goals we are not acting irresponsibly. For my part, although the immediate effect of this legislation on Nebraska may be minimal, it will receive my closest attention throughout its consideration, because criminal justice is one area in which we must maintain a firm standard.

THE LEGACY OF APOLLO-SOYUZ

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the joint American-Russian orbital mission has been criticized by some as a "useless stunt." But a special feature article which appeared in the Analog Science Fiction/Science Fact magazine in August calls it a "useless stunt" like Apollo, like sputnik, like Lindbergh, Columbus, and Marco Polo. I commend this well-written article by James E. Oberg to my colleagues:

THE LEGACY OF APOLLO-SOYUZ

(By James E. Oberg)

Sixty days before blastoff, the main Salyut crew module arrived at Cape Canaveral in a Soviet AN-22 jet transport. After unloading at the runway, the spacecraft was taken to the Payload Assembly Building and placed into the payload bay of Space Shuttle number three in preparation for mission SS-22.

The Japanese equipment was still being mated to the Spacelab pallet in Germany, and anxious trans-Atlantic messages were ex-

changed concerning a possible launch delay. The Soviets expressed unofficial concern about impacting tracking requirements for their planned lunar landing flight.

The standard pre-launch Space Shuttle preparations unfolded without a hitch. Mission SS-22 proceeded to the Vehicle Assembly Building for mating with the fuel tank and solid boosters. Shortly before rollout, pyrotechnics and batteries were installed. The companion pallet payload, which had finally arrived safely, was installed in the second operational Space Shuttle being prepared as mission SS-23 in an adjacent bay of the VAB.

Launch day arrived for the first mission. The three American crewmen and the four Russian passengers entered the spaceship on the pad. Flight commander Dick Truly was on his sixth spaceflight, his second with Russians along. The two groups exchanged pleasantries in Russian and English before strapping themselves in for takeoff.

With its three main engines and two solid fuel boosters firing in unison, the giant space plane rose from the flames. Following a nominal launch sequence, the solids burned out and fell away as planned, while the fuel from the main tank took SS-22 nearly into orbit. The tank separated with a clang and a thud of explosive bolts, to disintegrate over the Pacific Ocean, while the Orbiter vehicle pushed into orbit with its own onboard maneuvering engines. The retrograde orbit needed for this mission had been obtained through the relaxation of some safety requirements, but past successful experience had prompted NASA officials to authorize the overland launch on these two flights. The alternative would have been to wait for the West Coast facility to become operational in four more years.

After twelve hours of trims and minor rocket maneuvers, the spaceship was in the required sun-synchronous orbit several hundred miles above the Earth. The cosmonauts transferred into the Salyut for the final preseparation checkout.

The four Russians strapped themselves in at the Salyut control station, and Space Shuttle flight engineer Carl Konkel fired the charges which cut the connections between the two vehicles. The grappler arm slowly swung the payload free. When it was sufficiently clear, Salyut test commander Yuri Romanenko opened the craft's solar panels and radio antennas. They were now ready for independent flight, and the American spaceship returned to Earth a few hours later.

Six days later mission SS-23 was launched, after Romanenko had reported that the Salyut equipment had been completely checked out. Mission commander Bruce McCandless completed the rendezvous with the Salyut and prepared to disgorge his vehicle's special cargo. The grappler arm swung the twenty-ton package out into space, where Colonel Romanenko lined up his own vehicle for a manual docking. The modules linked together, and two spacesuited cosmonauts completed a permanent welding job on the attachment interface. The spacecraft was ready.

Through an inflated fabric transfer tunnel, the Space Shuttle and the Salyut prepared to exchange crews. The four cosmonauts who had checked out the Salyut would now turn it over to the actual mission crewmen who had ridden up in the Space Shuttle.

Congratulations and best wishes were exchanged among the American Shuttle crew, the Soviet Salyut test crew, and the four men who were about to undertake the most difficult manned space voyage ever attempted.

Spacemen Vladimir Dzhanibekov, Maarten Houtman, Akinori Nakamura, and Franklin Musgrave were to spend 365 days in orbit. They would test the regenerative life-support systems that would enable men to reach Mars and beyond.

Their year-long international flight had been prepared by scientists and engineers all over the world. It would have been science fiction a decade before. Now it was just the inevitable legacy of Apollo-Soyuz.

In 1975, an American Apollo and Soviet Soyuz had linked up in orbit. Cosmonauts and astronauts had shaken hands in space. Although important engineering and scientific research was carried out on ASTP (the Apollo-Soyuz Test Project), the primary impact on the world was political and psychological. Cooperation was possible in space.

The immediate consequence of the joint ASTP flight was the opening of possibilities for new cooperative unmanned space missions. Even before the launching of the five spacemen, follow-on efforts were initiated. Late in 1975 an American instrument package spent three weeks in space on board a Soviet "Kosmos" biosatellite, the first time that Soviet and American scientists had exchanged hardware on a single mission. More advanced biosatellites were launched in the following years, and by 1978 American instruments had "hitchhiked" to the Moon aboard a robot "Luna" orbiter. In that same year a small Soviet satellite was launched into an equatorial orbit from the Italian San Marco platform off the coast of Africa.

Cooperation opened the route to the planets as well, although the Soviets had some difficult habitual barriers of their own to overcome. Following the successful Soviet Venus orbiter in 1975 and the American Mars landing in 1976, both countries began to discuss future research goals. It was hard for the Soviets to break with tradition and actually announce their future plans, but it slowly happened. The first really combined planetary exploration began in 1978 with the launchings of a pair of Venus probes by both countries.

Also in 1978, the International Deep Space Network was inaugurated with the reception at Goldstone of signals from the first Soviet Jupiter probe. NASA needed the use of similar Soviet tracking antennas in the Crimea to replace the 210-foot Spanish facility. Tied in to Goldstone and the Australian receivers, Soviet deep space probes could increase their data rate by an order of magnitude. Cooperation in space began to pay off.

One of the main advantages of the Apollo Soyuz docking was its spectacular symbolism, emphasized and accentuated by the fact that it was a manned space mission. Planners in both countries sought a feasible follow-on manned project which would continue to attract the surprisingly large worldwide public enthusiasm for the joint mission and other efforts like it.

A backup Apollo spacecraft and Saturn booster were available to NASA, and suggestions were discussed for an American visit to a planned six-man Soviet Salyut complex scheduled for space assembly in 1977. However promising these plans appeared, the Americans were compelled to back out for budgetary reasons.

Since the Soviets were also anxious to maintain this forward momentum which had been started with ASTP, they proposed an interim program for the five years before the US Space Shuttle became operational. US astronauts were invited to fly aboard Soviet Soyuz spacecraft in a special test program to try out new spacesuits and space rescue techniques.

A Russian cosmonaut and an American astronaut rode a Soyuz ship into orbit late in 1977 on the first shot of a three-flight "Intersoyuz" program. Both men wore American-built spacesuits of a radical new design. During their four days in orbit, spacemen Valery Bykovsky and Ronald Evans performed an extensive series of EVA experiments, including the first open-space untethered tests of the Astronaut Maneuvering Unit (AMU) first tried out inside the Skylab. The landing in Kazakhstan was normal in every respect.

The second jointly-manned flight the following spring called for a visit to the derelict Skylab space station, which had decayed in its orbit low enough for Soviet rockets to reach it. The Soyuz docking gear had to be replaced with equipment cannibalized from a surplus Apollo command module so that the Soviet ship could make a linkup with the Skylab's Multiple Docking Adaptor. Lieutenant Colonel Vladimir Dzhanibekov and Lieutenant Colonel Jack Lousma crossed into the space station and managed to activate the life-support systems with residual consumables left in the tanks.

This allowed the two pilots to work in shirt sleeves during their three-day visit, during which they tested various pieces of scientific equipment and made test observations of the Earth and the sun. They retrieved a special "time capsule" package of specimens designed to show the effects of long-term space exposure on various materials. During the last two days of the flight, after they had separated from Skylab, the men performed several EVAs to test the inflating and deorbiting procedures for a revolutionary new "space bailout" system.

This space bailout system was a new project initiated by the United States but shared with the Soviet Union. Once operational, the system would allow stranded spacemen of either country to leave their crippled spaceships and return to Earth unaided. Compact kits to be included on all future manned spacecraft would deploy into one-man heat shields. A small solid-fuel retrorocket could knock the space-suited man out of orbit. Once through the flames of reentry, the pilot would freefall until he deployed his individual parachute and recovery beacon.

This system worked well in theory, in ground tests, and on the space tests during the second joint Soyuz flight. Now it was time to try it for real. On the last planned Intersoyuz flight in 1979, Soviet cosmonaut General Aleksey Leonov commanded the ship while American astronaut Lieutenant Colonel Robert Overmyer prepared to play human meteor. The whole world watched in tense expectation, as the greatest space drama since Neil Armstrong's Moon step a decade before began to unfold.

The launching from Baikonur cosmodrome was routine, and the first day in orbit was spent checking out the bailout kit. Thirty-three hours after blastoff, astronaut Overmyer was descending by parachute through a Texas sky while recovery forces tuned in to his radio beacon. His purely ballistic uncontrolled re-entry brought him down sixty miles from his planned landing point, and the world held its breath until he was picked up. Cosmonaut Leonov urged on the rescuers from orbit, and he expressed his ultimate relief with a string of mixed Russian and English curses.

The following day Leonov conducted a surprise experiment of his own. After placing the Soyuz on autopilot, he donned the alternate bailout kit in the spaceship and cast himself off. His unexpected landing in the Ukraine turned out to be an authentic case of a real space emergency pickup, and he was severely reprimanded for taking the unnecessary risk. Leonov, who had been a champion parachutist and parachute instructor, confessed that he would never have forgiven himself if he had passed up this chance for the highest jump ever made.

The maturation of the new approach to joint space planning occurred during the Mars-9 and Mars-10 missions in 1977–1978, when the Soviets announced the flight schedules and experiments in advance of the actual launchings. A Soviet-American planning board was set up in Moscow, where they drew heavily upon U.S. Viking experience to put together the optimum science program for the three planned orbiter-lander probes. When the third shot failed to reach orbit, Moscow discovered that nobody held it against them, despite the twenty years of official Soviet gloating over American space failures (which were always prominently reported in the world press, even when American successes were ignored). The remaining two missions did much to fill in the gaps left by the Viking experiments, and a permanent cooperative Mars exploration directorate was established.

This joint effort led directly to the planning for the 1981 Mars sample-return mission, in which pairs of Soviet and American vehicles would be launched independently. The unmanned Soviet spacecraft would land on Mars and deploy a "Marsokhed" robot car similar to those landed in 1978. Soil samples would be collected and loaded into a small rocket stage for launch into orbit around Mars, just as Soviet robots had been returning soil samples from the Moon since 1970.

Once in orbit, the soil canister would be chased down by an American orbiter spacecraft, which would automatically dock with the Soviet satellite and transfer the soil samples by remote control from Earth. Blasting out of orbit, the American vehicle would begin a ten-month return voyage to Earth. It would eventually parachute back to waiting scientists in the USSR's Kazakhstan recovery zone.

Space cooperation would pay off again. A mission too complex and too expensive for either country was made possible by both countries. ASTP had shown American and Soviet space engineers how to work together, and the lesson was not forgotten or wasted.

By the late 1970s, Soviet and American space specialists were well on their way toward construction of their nations' next generation of manned spacecraft. The American "Space Shuttle" and the European "Spacelab" would carry payloads and scientists crews into orbit for research expeditions into the nature of space, of the Earth, of the sun, and of the universe.

The Soviets had a broader array of space vehicles under development. Their "Proton" and "Kosmograd" (or "G-class") boosters continued to make expendable flights into orbit. They had launched their 24-man Kosmograd space station in 1979, an impressive space outpost which was the size of Skylab but weighed half again as much. The two-man Soyuz manned spacecraft had become obsolete in all but its lunar versions, when a reusable twelve-man space ferry (launched on an expendable Proton booster) became operational in 1980.

Soviet and American space officials realized that the vehicles being developed in both countries could be complementary to each other if managed and coordinated carefully. To cooperate in such mission planning, permanent liaison offices were established at Houston and in Moscow, with branch offices in Washington and in Zvyozdniy ("Star Town," the home of the Soviet cosmonaut detachment). Both sides brought valuable and different approaches to the same problems: the Soviets adopted the American-designed weightless toilet, while the Americans began to use the USSR's water recycling equipment. Cooperation paid off.

Space pilot training also improved. All new spacemen of both nations (and later, from Europe and Japan) were required to learn and use a special two-hundred-word Russo-English space vocabulary in the event of an emergency space rescue situation. Voice transmission frequencies were standardized, and a worldwide alert system for emergency communications and landings was set up. Soviet cosmonauts trained for Extravehicular Activity in the Huntsville underwater facilities, and also trained for jungle landings at the US Air Force survival school in Panama. American students were regular visitors at Soviet arctic survival schools. Cooperation paid off economically and psychologically.

With the first Kosmograd and Space Shuttle missions carried out by 1980, NASA and the USSR Academy of Sciences realized that both countries had left gaps in their manned spaceflight capabilities. The large permanent Soviet space station was a valuable platform for space research, but it was also expensive and inflexible when new equipment was needed for special time-critical experiments. The first vehicle had been orbited in 1979, and a second was not planned for another three years. Heavy equipment was sent into space on strictly scheduled unmanned Proton launches every four months.

At the same time, U.S. officials realized that their total dependence on the Space Shuttle meant that no manned flight could be longer than the 30-day mission duration of the reusable space plane's orbiter section. This would eventually be overcome with the development of the "free-flying Spacelab" module which would be ready for testing in a few years. Meanwhile, all U.S. manned flights were restricted to a maximum of thirty days.

These restrictions were overcome in a makeshift fashion by new cooperative exchange programs. Soviet scientists flew on a Space Shuttle mission early in 1980, and two American scientist-astronauts spent three months in the Kosmograd station later that year. Space cooperation paid off.

It paid off again the following year when NASA's Space Shuttle mission 12 carried a Soviet Salyut module into orbit in response to the supernova in Auriga. The vehicle had been outfitted in two weeks and launched with a three-man crew on an extended monitoring mission. An American astronomer, Robert Parker, was included at the last minute in the crew. The flight was put together quicker than the Soviet could have done, and stayed in space longer than the Americans were capable of.

With the exciting results from Viking–2 in 1976 and Mars–9 in 1978, world scientists began to press for a manned expedition to Mars as soon as possible. The 1981 cooperative unmanned sample return mission was seen as only an intermediate step in a program of exploration which would see men on Mars by the late 1980s.

Simultaneously, two startling facts were noticed by space planners looking at the problems of manned flight to Mars. Even the best Soviet atmosphere, water, and food regenerative systems—chemical, mechanical, or biological—could not be made light enough and compact enough for the best American boosters to launch toward Mars. Better systems and better boosters were needed.

Meanwhile, one of the world's leading industrial and technological nations, whose population had always been fascinated with space exploration, had been left out of the US-Soviet-European space combine. Suddenly, the unique skills of Japan were crucial to success in the next step in man's conquest of space.

The resulting Ussuriysk conference in 1979 saw a formal invitation extended to Tokyo to design the regenerative life-support systems for a two-year manned expedition to Mars. The Japanese reacted enthusiastically. As the excitement engulfed the nation, thousands of private citizens began experimenting with "organic space gardens" to grow "Mars food." It was from the garden of postal inspector Shinobu Tsukahara that the now-famous "Japple" fruit was developed, to feed men on Mars as well as starving multitudes in Bangaldesh, Brazil, and Ethiopia.

Japan had always been a resource-limited nation, where efficient recycling of all by-products was an absolute necessity. In the late 1970s, the Japanese had finally overcome their suffocating industrial pollution to develop a resource-regeneration industry which became a model for the rest of the world. Now traditional virtues were combined with futuristic visions, and the result in national pride and ingenuity was astounding to foreigners and Japanese alike.

Preliminary systems were ready for space testing within eighteen months, but space planners were dismayed to find out that there were no appropriate vehicles to test them with. The Kosmograd was too inflexible, the Space Shuttle was too brief, and the ferry vehicles were too small.

So a new space mission was born from the unique and complementary capabilities of the four main space powers. A Soviet Salyut laboratory would be modified to carry control and communications gear and living quarters for the men. The Europeans modified a "Spacelab" pallet to support the Japanese garden. The two separate payloads would be launched by American Space Shuttles into "sun-synchronous" retrograde orbits where they would experience continuous sunlight for the duration of the mission.

Four spacemen would represent the world on this test of new engineering skills needed to fly to Mars, and of man's ability to withstand the long periods of weightlessness on the way. The mission commander would be a Russian, since the main spacecraft was Soviet. The mission engineer would be a European, since they had designed the supporting equipment for the experiments. The mission scientist would be Japanese, since they had designed the botanical systems. The mission flight surgeon would be American, since thy had the most experience in space medicine. The common language would be English. By late 1981, the four men were picked, trained, and ready.

The success of this bold mission, and the success of the joint Soviet-American automatic Mars sample return effort under way at the same time, would be critical for the planning for a manned flight to Mars. If all went well, the pieces would fall into place within five years. It would not cost anywhere near the horrible fifty-billion-dollar figure quoted by opponents a decade before; the total US expenditure would be closer to ten billion dollars in 1975 prices.

The Americans, meanwhile, pushed on with plans for the development of a nuclear rocket stage for use in space. It would reopen the road to the Moon and make flight to Mars possible. The effort had temporarily been stalled when the designed vehicle appeared to be far too large and heavy for the limited payload bay of the Space Shuttle. This restriction was overcome when the Soviets volunteered (on an exchange reimbursable basis) the use of their large Kosmograd booster which had three times the lifting power of the Space Shuttle. Space cooperation paid off again, and men all over the world turned their eyes on Mars.

When the first man stepped out onto the surface of Mars several years later, the whole Earth watched. The whole Earth had sent him. It was the legacy of Apollo-Soyuz.